

I submit, Mr. President, as I testified before the McClellan committee some weeks ago, that the present Corrupt Practices Act is a fraud. It is a well of deception. It is poisoning the stream of political life, because its very terms encourage falsification, deceit, and evasion. I think it must be amended so that the American people will know of every cent that goes into the campaign expenses of any candidate for Congress or for the Presidency of the United States, instead of permitting what all of us in the Senate know is a policy of campaign expenditure reporting that carries out the big lie technique, which I am afraid has come to rear its head in American political life. If we are going to decapitate it, Mr. President, as we must, before it does further damage to our body politic, we need drastically to revise the Corrupt Practices Act. But I shall delay until another date a discussion of the provisions of a bill which I shall introduce, for a revision of the Corrupt Practices Act.

I close for tonight by saying that I sincerely hope that the committee concerned and the majority leader will act with expedition before the end of this session of Congress so that there may be enacted into law the recommendations submitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States.

#### RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10:00 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, September 28, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate September 27 (legislative day of September 19), 1951:

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John A. Roseen, of California, to be United States marshal for the northern district of California, vice Edward J. Carrigan.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all grace, may our thoughts now go out toward Thee in adoration and in aspiration for Thou art always seeking to make our minds and hearts the sanctuaries of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

We pray that Thou wilt take complete possession of our lives, transfiguring them into the glorious likeness of Thy divine spirit and transforming them from what they are to what they were meant to be and can be.

Inspire us with a faith that will enable us to conquer those dark moods of cynicism and defeatism which so frequently haunt and overshadow us.

When we encounter problems and situations which seem to grow more diffi-

cult the longer we ponder them, grant that they may not cause us to doubt but may we bring them unto thee for Thou alone canst solve them.

Bless all who are giving themselves to the high endeavor for the freedom and peace of humanity and may there be more of the spirit of brotherhood among the nations instead of each seeking its own ends.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 25, 1951:

H. R. 608. An act for the relief of Kiyoko Matsuo; and

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman.

On September 26, 1951:

H. R. 725. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd.; and

H. R. 1971. An act for the relief of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian.

On September 27, 1951:

H. R. 3731. An act for the relief of Megumi Takagi.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent that it be in order on Wednesday next to call the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar. I overlooked including in my request that it might also be in order on Wednesday next that the Speaker be authorized to recognize Members for the consideration of bills under suspension of the rules. I now make that request.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object because I hope the request is granted, might it not be well, may I suggest to the distinguished majority leader, to tell us about the program for next week or would he prefer to do that later.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to do that now.

On Monday and Tuesday, there will be no legislative business. For the remainder of the week, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and I will include Saturday, too, the program will be as follows: On Wednesday, the Consent and Private Calendars will be called. There will be one bill taken up under the suspension of rules, and that is the bill, H. R. 5118, having to do with certain amendments to the Social Security and Unemployment Insurance Act.

Then there is a bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act.

Then there is House Resolution 426, for further study and investigation by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with relation to railroad retirement.

Then there is Senate bill 1335, to adjust the weight and size of fourth-class postal service.

Then there is a bill relating to schools under impact of the emergency in critical defense housing areas, which will follow Senate bill 1335.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In reading the list of bills to be taken up, I did not hear the gentleman mention the flood relief bill that is supposed to come up shortly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman advise me what particular bill he has in mind?

Mr. SCRIVNER. It is a bill that has been referred to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Hearings have been concluded on the bill and it is being marked up and will be reported to the whole committee and it will be ready to be taken up on the floor next week. It is a matter of exceptional emergency and we have expedited consideration of the measure and will have it ready Monday, or whenever the House is ready for its consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. As the Members know, I am sure, my program is based upon rules that are at present outstanding. The bill to which the gentleman from Kansas referred, of course, is still in committee. If any vital, important legislation or an appropriation bill is reported out—I know of no appropriation bill for next week—is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. The bill for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas is in response to the President's request for \$400,000,000 for flood relief.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that is not the military public-works appropriation bill or the ECA?

Mr. CANNON. ECA is being considered with foreign aid and is waiting the outcome of Chairman RICHARDS' conference with the Senate. All other appropriation bills are in conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. But there are two bills in subcommittee, the ECA appropriation bill and the military public-works bill.

Mr. CANNON. Of course, we cannot do anything on the ECA-foreign-aid bill, until the authorization bill is passed by the legislative committee. It is my understanding that the Committee on Foreign Affairs expects to reach an agreement with the Senate on the legislative bill next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. But neither of them will be ready for next week?

Mr. CANNON. Neither of them will be ready for next week, but the rehabilitation bill will be ready any time after Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understand the program for today, if it is completed we will adjourn over until Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Of course, in view of the importance of the bill, when I announced the program, if any very important bill is reached, it is understood that subject to conferences and an understanding between the leadership, it would be put on the program, and if the bill is reported out, to which the gentleman referred, and about which the gentleman from Missouri has given information, naturally I will do everything I can to get it on next week.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why is there no legislative business scheduled for Monday and Tuesday? Why pile it up from Wednesday on until the end of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a proper inquiry. Monday and Tuesday are holidays of the Jewish faith. Does that answer the gentleman's question? We recognize holy days of the Christian faith, and that is the reason.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Would the leadership take up on Monday or Tuesday conference reports where there is no controversy?

Mr. McCORMACK. I prefer not to. I prefer to let them wait until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that any time the conferees on any appropriation bill are ready to report, he will be very glad to recognize them to adopt the report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will that be on Monday and Tuesday, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not want the Speaker and myself to be in disagreement.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be glad to.

Mr. HOEVEN. Can the distinguished majority leader tell the House what progress is being made on conference reports?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to advise the gentleman. I understand the ECA conference committee has pretty nearly reached an agreement, but in relation to the others I am unable to give the gentleman any information.

Mr. HOEVEN. It is my understanding that the conferees on the civil functions bill have not yet met. That bill was passed on September 13. I see the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations present. I should like to ask him why that bill has not gone to conference.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield—

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The conferees on the civil functions bill have not yet convened because the Senators are not yet ready. On this side a Member serves on one subcommittee only; on the other side many of the Senators are on half a dozen subcommittees. Some of the Senators

are on conflicting conferences and as soon as they are ready to meet on the civil functions bill we shall be glad to meet with them.

Mr. HOEVEN. Does the gentleman anticipate that that may happen next week?

Mr. CANNON. I hope so. We are urging every conference committee to conclude its work as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will the gentleman state why the Senate is not ready?

Mr. CANNON. They have other conferences. As soon as they conclude their work on the other conferences they will then be ready to proceed with the civil functions bill.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am glad to have that information because it was my understanding that the matter was held up on this side of the Capitol.

Mr. CANNON. This side has been ready for some time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it would be well for Members of this House to inform the Members of the other House that there are thousands and hundreds of thousands of acres of land lying along the Missouri River from Sioux City to Kansas City that are today under water or have been under water, and out of production, and will be out of production not only this year but, unless something is done to give the Army engineers the 1952 fiscal year funds to use this fall and soon, thousands upon thousands of acres of that land will also be out of production next year.

The Army engineers are stymied because of the fact that they have no funds with which to do the necessary work on channel maintenance, bank erosion, and flood control and to take the water off these flooded areas.

The floodwaters of the Missouri River from Sioux City to Kansas City is eating away at the banks of that river and destroying thousands of acres of the best land in America. In my district alone there are at least 20 bends in the river where good farm land is constantly being eaten away now at a terrific rate. It is criminal to let this go on while the funds, for no good reason, for the Army engineers is held up by the other body. Those funds are needed not only for the Missouri River but for a lot of other rivers in America today.

I think we should inform the other body that there is criminal waste going on because of the delay in passing the civil functions appropriation bill out of conference.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am entirely in sympathy with the position which the gentleman takes, and I may say that we take for granted that the Senate conferees are fully aware of the situation to which the gentleman refers; also when we had a request from the President for \$400,000,000 for rehabilitation of flood-devastated areas, we expedited that bill more rapidly than any bill of its character recently considered in the committee.

The bill is delayed by reason of the fact that those in charge of the preparation of the estimates did not supply the data. It was impossible for us to take up the bill until the department supplied the data required by the statute. As soon as that was available we opened hearings. We have heard everyone who desired to be heard. Hearings were concluded yesterday; we will be ready to bring the bill up in the House at any time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there money in this supplemental disaster bill for Kansas and Missouri for the Army engineers to expend on such things as I have just explained along the Missouri River from Sioux City to Kansas City.

Mr. CANNON. I take for granted the gentleman is familiar with the bill under consideration.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly am not, because I have not seen it.

Mr. CANNON. It has been available to the gentleman. I am sorry he has not taken advantage of the opportunity to read it.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, wait a minute; the gentleman knows that is not a fact.

Mr. CANNON. On the contrary, it is a fact. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] introduced the bill more than a month ago, and it has been available in the document room ever since. House Document No. 228, which may also be secured in the document room, will supply any further information the gentleman may require on the subject.

The gentleman should also be familiar with the civil functions bill. It is explained in detail in the House and Senate reports which may be obtained in the document room any time the gentleman wishes to consult them.

Mr. JENSEN. Now the gentleman is getting entirely away from the point I am making. I have not seen the bill which the committee has reported out for Missouri and Kansas flood-disaster relief. The gentleman knows that. So I am asking him if there is any money in the bill for the things I have just talked about, on the Missouri River from Sioux City to Kansas City.

Mr. CANNON. The committee has not reported out the bill. I have just explained that the subcommittee concluded hearings on the Bolling bill yesterday and will mark it up and have it ready for the whole committee the first of the week. In the meantime I shall be glad to supply him with a copy of the bill or with copies of the civil functions bill, or with a copy of House Document No. 228. Or he may secure them from the House document room where they have been available for some time.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Speaker be granted the privilege of recognizing to suspend the rules on Wednesday next? That is the matter before the House at the present time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



AMENDMENT TO ACT MAKING TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1952

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported House Joint Resolution 335, which was read a first and second time, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 335.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That clause (c) of section 4 of the joint resolution of July 1, 1951 (Public Law 70), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "September 30, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 31, 1951."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY DUPLICATION AND OVERLAPPING OF TAXES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 414 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to investigate and study duplication and overlapping of Federal, State, and local government taxes, and the means and method of accomplishing the elimination of such overlapping and duplication.

The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to subpoena witnesses, to sit and act at such times and places during the life of the committee as it shall designate; to employ an executive secretary; and to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it may deem necessary (without regard to the civil-service laws, but subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended). The committee may utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following: "That the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized and directed to further investigate and study the means and method of accomplishing the elimination of competition, overlapping and duplication of sources of Federal, State, and local government taxes, and to report back to the House its recommendations with respect thereto before the close of the present Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the very intelligent presentation on the part of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] who introduced the original resolution authorizing a special committee to make this investigation, the Rules Committee came to the conclusion that to create another special committee would be unnecessary although it agreed with him that an investigation should be made.

At the hearing before the Rules Committee the Ways and Means Committee was represented by two or three of its outstanding members, who assured the Rules Committee that this matter has been receiving consideration and the members also testified the committee had been in constant touch with the Conference of Governors of the States from year to year and with the mayors and other officials and groups on the local level with a view to bringing about unification of thought and elimination of waste and duplication which generally accompanies all revenue or tax legislation.

As I said to the committee at that time, it might be very pleasant to the American people if we could eliminate all taxation. I do not think any objection would be raised. However, the Government must have revenue, consequently taxation is necessary. I hope that from now on we will be able to bring about the economy that the administration is trying to accomplish. Were it not for the fact that a great deal of money is needed for the defense program, for preserving our democratic institutions, and bringing about the elimination of the activities on the part of the Communist countries against those democratic institutions, I feel that taxes could be materially reduced and the burdens on the people lightened.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand the Committee on Rules has agreed also to report out a resolution to create a special committee to investigate whether foundations for evading taxation are being organized. Does not the gentleman feel that the Committee on Ways and Means might handle that matter, and it might easily be included under this resolution for the purpose of inquiry, if it was found desirable? I think the resolution relates to investigating whether foundations such as charitable foundations have been organized to evade taxes. It is the reso-

lution sponsored, I think, by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. Does not the gentleman feel that the Committee on Ways and Means can do that as well, and that it ought to be in this resolution?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from New York has a misconception of the real purport of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. His resolution deals, in main, with another phase of the activities of these foundations. However, I do agree with the gentleman from New York that the Ways and Means Committee might well give further and more comprehensive study to the tax evasion practices of these private and charitable trusts and foundations as the gentleman suggests. I called the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means to the possibilities for greatly increased revenues through the closing of these loopholes in the tax structure so that the burdens of taxation upon the smaller taxpayers could be reduced, and in the lower brackets completely eliminated, but so far that great committee has been unable to come to a conclusion on this troublesome question.

I hope the Committee on Ways and Means will continue its effort to bring about the elimination of the many loopholes taken advantage of by these private trusts and foundations and also act on the matter to which the gentleman has called attention.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. May I say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules that in the tax bill of 1950 we did include tax provisions for certain types of charitable trusts. Our committee went pretty thoroughly into the question, as much so as we could in connection with that bill. But when you get into the area of possible taxation of religious institutions and matters of that nature, it requires a great deal of study. Our committee has been studying that subject. However, I did want the gentleman to know that we have already taken steps to tax certain incomes of charitable trusts.

Mr. SABATH. I am glad the Committee on Ways and Means has made this effort, and that they will continue their thorough investigation and bring about legislation that will eliminate all the matters to which the gentleman from New York has called attention.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question about the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means has the power to investigate the subject to which I just referred, about charitable foundations.

Mr. SABATH. That is true. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there cannot possibly be any objection to this resolution I shall conclude my remarks. I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM], the author of this resolution and who, I understand, has agreed that it should be considered as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a very brief statement to the remarks of the distinguished chairman

of the Committee on Rules, who has been so kind in his discussion of this resolution of mine.

I want to point out that the problem which this resolution focuses attention upon is becoming more important and more difficult with each passing day and each passing month.

The Federal Government must of necessity raise huge tax sums to carry on the Government. The States on the other hand need money for their operating expenses. The municipalities are getting into fiscal trouble—more of them each day, as time passes. Most of the big cities in this country today are approaching fiscal crises. And the little taxpayer, who is being hunted and hounded from all three sides, is most confused. He does not know where his tax dollars are going, and he does not and cannot keep track of how they are spent.

One or two simple little illustrations, I am sure, will illustrate the problem.

Let us take the case of the gasoline tax. A man walks into a gas station and buys a single gallon of gasoline for his car. That sale is taxed by the Federal Government. It is taxed by the State government, and then it is hit by the local government—the cities, which in some cases impose a levy by way of the sales tax.

While the man is in the gas station, he buys a pack of cigarettes. We know that the Federal Government has an 8-cent Federal tax on a pack of cigarettes, and many of the States tax another 8 cents for that pack of cigarettes. In some cities, there is a 3-cent tax on the cigarettes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman, and realize perhaps the urgent need for a committee of this sort, but will not the gentleman agree that the reason these taxes have mounted to such a large volume in the States, cities, municipalities, and the Federal Government, is the fundamental monetary policy of the Government with our huge debt and extravagant spending of the Federal Government with the consequent reduction in the value of the dollar?

Mr. LATHAM. I do not think there is much question of that.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, this committee then will be attempting to investigate something that has been brought about by a situation which the committee will not investigate at all? In other words, it is not investigating the value of the dollar or the reduction in the value of the dollar, and the reduction in its purchasing power, but they will investigate the consequent results of the reduction of the value of the dollar as a result of Government policy.

Mr. LATHAM. The investigation will be carried on by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. The thought behind this resolution is not to try to tell anybody which particular tax should be put on, and which should be taken off.

This was recommended by the Hoover Commission, a nonpartisan, nonpolitical

expert group, and it was also recommended by the Conference of Governors, as well as the Council of Mayors—as I was saying, the thought is that by agreement, if possible, the Federal, State, and local governments should get together and separate the areas of taxation for each level of government.

It should be done and it must be done. You have duplication, and you have waste. The Federal Government hires tax clerks and stenographers, and uses paper and makes records, and goes through all the red tape, and spends a lot of money to collect a given tax.

The State government duplicates all this in many cases. The cities, the local governments, then further duplicate it. There is all that waste.

If a tax can be imposed and efficiently collected, let us say by the Federal Government, then why not by agreement let the Federal Government collect that tax.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The thing I am unable to understand is the necessity for this legislation. Does not the Committee on Ways and Means already have the power to investigate overlapping and duplication of taxes?

Mr. LATHAM. It has.

Mr. GROSS. I wish the gentleman would explain the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. LATHAM. The Committee on Ways and Means has the power, and it has been giving much attention to this. But, the fact is, it is becoming more critical all the time and nothing has been done. The main function of this will be to focus attention on this increasingly difficult and dangerous situation and obtain a definite recommendation by the end of this Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me that it might also be said to the gentleman from Iowa that the passage of this resolution will be in the nature of a mandate or at least an expression of congressional desire that they do go into this very important question. It seems to me that the gentleman from New York has approached this in an extremely constructive manner, and in a way which shows his own broad-minded approach to all these problems. I hope the gentleman will be with us for many years despite his present political activities. I should hate to see the value of the gentleman to this body lost to us. However, I do wish the gentleman in his present political activity all the best from this side of the aisle.

Mr. LATHAM. I wish to thank the gentleman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. First I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] for conceiving this step, which is most desirable. I should like

to say at this point, however, that this resolution which you have sponsored is certainly a step in the right direction. But in my judgment, it does not go half far enough. It seems to me that the time has arrived when the Congress should recognize the need for the proper determination of responsibilities and services, as well as tax revenues as between Federal, State, and local governments. There is a bill pending before one of the committees which would create such a commission of intergovernmental relations. That commission is recommended by the Hoover Commission, and while this first step you have proposed is very desirable, I hope it will be only the forerunner of a proper study by a commission of relations between the Federal, State, and local taxing authorities.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman, and I would like to say, unless this is done by agreement, before very long the taxpayers of this country are going to rise up and demand a constitutional amendment to take away the Federal taxing powers in certain areas.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I asked the gentleman to yield in order to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] had before his committee, the Rules Committee of the House, a resolution to set up a special committee to conduct this investigation. When it was called to his attention that the Ways and Means Committee had given a great deal of time to the examination of this question, that the committee was staffed with some of the best experts of the country, he very readily yielded to the suggestion that this work be put into the hands of the Ways and Means Committee. In other words, the gentleman from New York passed up his resolution to set up a special committee, accepting the suggestion that the Ways and Means Committee continue its study of this very important question. His fine attitude is the thing that I want to call to the attention of the House. I can see no possible objection to this resolution, and I hope there will not be a vote cast against it.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I heard the gentleman address the public on the radio the other night, explaining this resolution. In his explanation he stated that the gasoline tax, as an example, in his opinion should be collected by the Federal Government. Now, if you believe that, do you think that if the Federal Government should collect all gasoline taxes across the country, would they then in turn be obligated to return to the States their proportionate share that would otherwise be collected by the States individually?

Mr. LATHAM. It is quite possible that after separating the areas of taxa-



tion and assigning them to one level of government, in all equity and fairness there should be some rebate. That might well be worked out, as a possible solution.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Of course, if in California the Federal Government collected all of the gasoline tax, then we would not be able to maintain our highway system unless we had a rebate of our share of the amount of taxes collected by the Federal Government back to the State of California. Do you mean to say that this method of collection should repeal the obligation of the States to collect their individual taxes?

Mr. LATHAM. I do not say that any one tax should go to any one level of government. I just present the problem and say that somebody should do something to eliminate the waste and inefficiency that we have at the present time. It is not for me to go into detail and try to work out the problem at all. It is possible there should be some rebate. It might be it will have to be worked out that way. But at least we should try to eliminate all duplication of collection by three separate agencies.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gasoline tax is one tax that is very easily collected. Is there any other commodity that you know of that is now taxed that would come under that same category if this resolution were adopted and the investigation made?

Mr. LATHAM. In fact, the United States Treasury report of 1946 said that 90 percent of all Government taxes overlapped. The cigarette tax, the income tax, the gasoline tax all overlap.

You have income taxes sometimes on three levels of government at the present time. The Federal Government, the State, and city governments are operating in the income-tax field. There is duplication of inheritance taxes; there is duplication of liquor taxes; there is duplication of amusement taxes.

This has been studied a great deal by the Conference of Governors, the Council of Mayors, and the Hoover Commission, and they all urge that something should be done.

This resolution I have introduced authorizes the Committee on Ways and Means to report back to the House its findings by the end of the present Congress. At that time this situation will be even more critical than it is today, because every large city in the United States is approaching a fiscal crisis.

I hope the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. SABATH. In view of the intelligent and careful explanation of the resolution given us by the gentleman from New York, I cannot understand how there could be any possible objection to the resolution. I, therefore, move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means of the House to investigate and study duplication and overlapping of taxes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONSERVATORS FOR THE ESTATES OF CERTAIN PERSONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 11) to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1026)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 11) to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That if an adult person residing in or having property in the District of Columbia is unable, by reason of advanced age, mental weakness (not amounting to unsoundness of mind), or physical incapacity properly to care for his property, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may, upon his petition or the sworn petition of one or more of his relatives or any other person or persons, appoint some fit person to be conservator of his property.

"Sec. 2. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall fix a time and place for a hearing thereon; and shall cause at least fourteen days' notice thereof to be given to the person for whom a conservator is sought to be appointed, if he is not the petitioner, and to such other persons as the court shall direct. The petition shall include, among other things—

"(1) the reasons for the appointment of a conservator;

"(2) the name and address of the person for whom the conservator is sought;

"(3) the date and place of his birth, if known; and

"(4) the names and addresses of the nearest known heirs at law, or the next of kin, if any.

The court in its discretion may appoint some disinterested person to act as guardian ad litem in any proceeding hereunder. Upon a finding that the person for whom the conservator is sought is incapable of caring for his property, the court shall appoint a conservator who shall have the charge and management of the property of such person subject to the direction of the court.

"Sec. 3. Such conservator before entering upon the discharge of his duties shall execute an undertaking with surety to be approved by the court in such maximum amount as the court may order, conditioned on the faithful performance of his duties as such conservator; and he shall have control of the estate, real and personal, of the person for whom he has been appointed conservator,

with power to collect all debts due such person, and upon authority of the court to adjust and settle all accounts owing by him, and to sue and be sued in his representative capacity. He shall apply such part of the annual income and such part of the principal of the estate of such person as the court may authorize to the support of such person and the maintenance and education of his family and children; and shall in all other respects perform the same duties and have the same rights and powers with respect to the property of such person as have guardians of the estates of infants.

"Sec. 4. When any person for whom a conservator has been appointed under the provisions of this act shall become competent to manage his property, he may apply to such court to have such conservator discharged and to be restored to the care and control of his property. If the court finds him to be competent, an order shall be entered restoring the care and control of his property to such person. The court shall have the same powers with respect to the property of any person for whom a conservator has been appointed as it has with respect to the property of infants under guardianships.

"Sec. 5. Upon filing of a petition as provided by this Act the court may, with or without notice or hearing, appoint a temporary conservator of the estate of any person hereunder, if it deems such action necessary for the protection of such estate, subject to the provisions for an undertaking contained in section 3 hereof. Such temporary conservator shall serve only until such time as a permanent conservator can be appointed or until sooner discharged.

"Sec. 6. The court, in its discretion, may at any time order that the conservator or some other person shall be responsible for the personal welfare of the person whose property is under conservatorship. In such event the conservator or such other person, subject to the direction and control of the Civil Division of the court, shall have the same powers and duties with respect to the personal welfare of the said person as have the guardians of the persons of infants under guardianships.

"Sec. 7. *Lis pendens*: Upon the filing of a petition hereunder, a certified copy of such petition may be filed for record in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia. If a conservator be appointed on such petition, all contracts, except for necessities, and all transfers of real and personal property made by the ward after such filing and before the termination of the conservatorship shall be void."

And the House agree to the same.

That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: "An Act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets and provide for the personal welfare of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity."

OREN HARRIS,  
T. G. ABERNETHY,  
JOSEPH P. O'HARA.

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

JOHN O. PASTORE,  
WILLIS SMITH,  
JOHN M. BUTLER,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 11) to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees

and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment was passed in lieu of all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The accompanying conference report recommends the adoption of a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The differences between the House amendment and the conference substitute, except for merely formal differences and minor clerical and conforming changes, are explained below.

The first section of the Senate bill provided for the appointment of conservators to conserve the property of individuals residing or having property in the District of Columbia who, by reason of advanced age, mental weakness (not amounting to unsoundness of mind), or physical incapacity are incapable of caring for such property. The House amendment included a clause providing for such appointments in certain additional cases where such individuals, because of gambling, idleness, or debauchery, so spend or waste their estates or injure their persons as to be likely to expose themselves or their families to want or suffering. The first section of the conference substitute omits the clause which was added by the House amendment and adopts substantially the language of the Senate bill, except that the application of the section is limited in terms to adults, as it was in the House amendment, in order to show clearly that it is not intended to supplant existing laws relating to the property of minors.

Section 2 of the conference substitute, following the House amendment, lists some of the information which is to be included in the petition for a conservator, but omits the House language specifically requiring that the petition designate the proposed conservator and describe the property and debts of the person for whom the conservator is sought.

The House amendment provided for the appointment of guardians of the persons, as well as of the property, of the individuals referred to in the first section, while the Senate bill provided only for conservators of the property of such individuals. The conference substitute generally follows the Senate bill and strikes out all references to personal guardians, but adds a new section 6 which provides that the court may at any time order that the conservator or some other person shall be responsible for the personal welfare of the individual whose property is under conservatorship.

Since responsibility for the personal welfare of individuals under conservatorship is exclusively provided for under the new section 6, the conference substitute omits the authority (which was contained in sec. 4 of the House amendment) for appointment of more than one guardian for any one individual, and uses the Senate term "conservator" throughout in lieu of the House term "guardian".

The conference substitute embodies section 8 of the House amendment, which provided that all contracts (except for necessities) and property transfers made by an individual under conservatorship shall be void. The corresponding section of the Senate bill provided only that contracts and business transactions of any such individual shall be presumed to be a fraud upon the conservator.

The title of the conference substitute is the same as the title of the Senate bill, except that additional language has been inserted to indicate that (in sec. 6 of the conference substitute) the personal welfare of individuals whose property is under conservatorship has been adequately provided for.

OREN HARRIS,  
T. G. ABERNETHY,  
JOSEPH P. O'HARA,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. FARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report agreed to by the House and Senate conferees on Senate bill 11, a bill which would provide for the appointment of conservators in the District of Columbia to protect the interests of persons incapable of managing their own property. There was one point of difference on this legislation as passed by the House and the Senate. The term "guardian" was provided in the House bill by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. O'HARA) and the term "conservator" as passed in the Senate bill.

The conferees have agreed on a new section, section 6, which clarifies the issue with reference to responsibility for the personal welfare of an individual under conservatorship appointment. This is a very good conference report. It is legislation I think needed in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S CENSORSHIP ORDER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. If there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I am appalled by the censorship order handed down Wednesday by President Truman. In the guise of protecting the Nation from its enemies, Mr. Truman has issued a directive whose real purpose can only be to protect his administration from the American people.

A free press is the first guardian of democracy. In the past few years we have witnessed countless examples of how diligent, truth-seeking newspapermen have served the cause of democracy in our own land by unearthing and exposing incredible rascality and skulduggery in the top circles of the Truman administration. The 5-percent scandals involving the White House were first disclosed by a courageous newspaper. The American Lithofold scandal was first broken by another enterprising newspaper. There are innumerable other cases where betrayals of democracy would never have come to the attention of the people except for a press that was determined to get the truth.

Now President Truman is seeking to change all that. His censorship order gives every agency and department of the Government the absolute power to decide what information shall be given out to the people and what shall be kept from them. These agency heads are absolute czars unto themselves. When they order the iron curtain down it stays down—a gag on the press and radio of the Nation. Even Members of Congress may be denied the information they need to conduct the affairs of Congress.

Mr. Truman's censorship is completely alien to the spirit of America and our

Republic. What have we in the White House, a Pennsylvania Avenue Peron?

#### CANADA TURNS DOWN PRICE CONTROL

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, this is for the interest of those who are confused with the orders out of the OPS office and those who voted against the price-control bill, a small item from the Associated Press Service of yesterday, reading as follows:

#### FINANCE MINISTER REJECTS PRICE CONTROL FOR CANADA

OTTAWA, September 26.—No price ceilings for Canada, her Finance Minister says.

The Minister, Douglas Abbott, said in a broadcast last night that a temporary reduction in living standards is the price Canadians must pay for freedom and security.

M. J. Coldwell, Socialist Party leader, had called on Mr. Abbott to institute price ceilings.

Mr. Abbott said that in World War II, price control played only a small part in the attack on inflation. A tough taxation policy and an intense saving program were the government's chief weapons then.

He declared that prices in the last 6 months have been rising faster in Britain, which has a complete control system, than in either Canada or the United States.

We should learn a sound economic lesson from the Finance Minister of Canada on price control.

The price-control policy of the Truman administration will never cure inflation as long as they continue their policy of extravagant deficit spending.

We need a pay-as-you-go tax policy which must be accompanied with a caution as you spend, not a spend as you please all over the world policy. There is a bottom to our money barrel. There is a limit to the people's patience. And it is my opinion that the Truman administration has hit both.

#### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the bill H. R. 5426, which is a Reserve matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### GOV. WILLIAM S. BEARDSLEY, OF THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. If there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly interested and very much disturbed by recent press reports which stated that Gov. William S. Beardsley, of the great midwestern State of Iowa, had sent a check of \$13,000 to the Bu-



reau of Internal Revenue to pay back income taxes, fines, and assessments.

The people of our country deserve the best in their elected officials no matter what party they belong to. Anyone who is paying \$13,000 in back taxes is either a poor keeper of his own accounts or someone who has violated the laws of his country. No matter what the reason, he hardly deserves to be responsible for the destiny of one of our most important States.

I understand that Governor Beardsley's tax case is a rather fantastic story. Perhaps the most fantastic thing of all is the Governor's statement, as quoted in the Des Moines Register for Thursday, September 13, in which he admits that he has offered to settle his income-tax case for \$13,000, and says that it is purely a personal matter. Since when, Mr. Speaker, is the integrity of the Governor of a great State purely a personal matter? This is certainly a matter which we should watch closely and even consider for possible criminal investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I have noticed accounts in Iowa newspapers that the Attorney General of the United States is being quoted as saying that this case will be handled objectively and that no attempt will be made to prosecute the Governor. This is certainly in contrast, Mr. Speaker, with the smear campaigns waged by certain irresponsible elements in the Republican Party.

#### WASTE

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a large heavy kraft envelope measuring about 12 by 16 inches. To me this is symbolic of a lot of the flagrant waste in our Government which not only should be but could be corrected, I think, by a little admonition from the Committee on Appropriations.

As to the cost of this envelope, it might not be great, but I believe in that old saying that if we watch our pennies the dollars will take care of themselves.

Enclosed within this envelope were two sheets of mimeographed paper, a very important publication from the Board of United States Civil Service Examiners, notifying me of an examination which was being held down at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. There is a waste of paper here. All of this could have been put on one sheet and enclosed in a cheap manila envelope and it would have accomplished all of the purposes desired.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the RECORD show I am back on the floor after having been excused officially on Un-American Activities Committee work in California?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement undoubtedly will be proof that he is here.

#### REDUCTION OF VETERANS' FACILITIES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article from the Boston Globe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from the Veterans' Administration office at Boston protesting the removal of the VA district office from Massachusetts. There is also included an article from the Boston Sunday Globe in which it is stated that the manager of the regional office at Boston has said that the men who should receive training and subsistence checks month by month will not get them until January due to curtailment of personnel from 173 to 49. If the cut in personnel act that went through the Congress cripples the service to the veterans and they are not going to get the money they are justly entitled to I think this personnel should be restored.

The letter and article referred to follows:

#### WIDOWS WORLD WAR I,

##### CHAPTER No. 6,

Framingham, Mass., September 24, 1951.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
Congressional Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: As president of Framingham Chapter No. 6, also junior vice of Massachusetts State chapter, I am appealing to you in regard to the return of the VA office to Boston.

Enclosed is a clipping from the Boston Globe; reading it you will understand why we do need this office returned. It is causing many hardships already. Not only for all those widows who have been thrown out of their positions but the veterans as well.

Our Mrs. Reynolds told us at our meeting last week how very nice you were to her while in Washington. May I take this opportunity to thank you for your graciousness to her. You have been a very great help to our organization and all the widows of World War I appreciate all you have done for them.

Thanking you again, I am

Respectfully yours,

HELEN E. GIMSKIE.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Globe of September 23, 1951]

#### GI BILL STUDENTS WARNED OF DELAY IN SUBSISTENCE CHECKS

Massachusetts GI-bill students will be hit in the pocketbooks as a result of a major cut in personnel handling Veterans' Administration subsistence checks, it was announced yesterday.

Manager William J. Blake, of the VA's Boston regional office, warned GI students they had better plan to support themselves until January—at which time it is expected the checks will be in the mails.

More than 24,000 students in Massachusetts colleges, universities, and other schools are expected to be affected.

Blame for the delay was laid to the reduction of employees handling the processing of the checks from 173 to 49.

Blake said the employees had been lopped from the processing section due to "budgetary limitations."

Checks—when finally mailed—will be retroactive to the date the student started classes.

#### FLOOD CONTROL DISASTER APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a portion of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to have the assurance of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the flood relief bill will be reported the first of next week and also the assurance of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, that when it is reported it will be taken up, perhaps next week.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with flood relief I have received a letter from a constituent this morning. This is not unusual, but this letter happens to be my No. 1 constituent, Mrs. Scrivner, who is home at this time. Here is what she wrote me after she had made a visit to the flood-devastated area in Kansas City, Kans.:

If they could just see that desolate, gray, mud-covered stinking mass of rubble, block after block, with signs "condemned" on it, Congress would understand the need for help immediately. Seeing Armourdale with water over it was nothing to what it looks like now. It is a ghost town, no lights, no sewers, no people. It is nothing but a stinking mass of mud-covered ruins that were once homes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that next week we will be able to remedy some of these conditions and bring relief to these people. The need is great. The need is now.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must not adjourn without passing a law which will help these flood refugees.

Surely if the United States can ladle out billions for war refugees all over the world we can send a few millions to our own hard-hit citizens, refugees from the havoc of the Nation's most disastrous flood.

#### CONTROLS

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, life, faculties, production—in other words, individuality, liberty, property—this is man. Life, liberty, and property do not exist because men have made laws. On the contrary, it was the fact that life, liberty, and property existed beforehand that caused men to make laws in the first place.

What then is law? It is the collective organization of the individual right to lawful defense of his person, his liberty, and his property. And the common force that protects the collective right cannot logically have any other purpose, or any other mission than that for which it acts as a substitute. Thus, since an individual cannot lawfully use force against the person, liberty, or property of

another individual, then the common force—for the same reason—cannot lawfully be used to destroy the person, liberty, or property of individuals or groups.

If this is true, then nothing can be more evident than this: The law is the organization of the natural right of lawful defense. Collective law is the organization of the extension of the natural right of lawful defense. And if a nation were to be thus founded on this basis, and if such law can be incorporated into a written constitution—as was ours—then such a nation would have the most simple, easy to accept, economical, limited, nonoppressive, just, and enduring government imaginable. So our founding fathers thought, planned, and wrote such law into our own Constitution. They publicly stated that government was best which governed least.

And hence very few powers were granted to the Federal Government by the sovereign people. Among them were such functions as these: to provide for the common defense, to provide for the common happiness, to conduct foreign affairs, to supervise dealings between the individual States, to coin money and regulate the value thereof, to establish and maintain a just system of weights and measures, to establish post offices and post roads, and, through the appended Bill of Rights, to maintain and support the enormous system of individual rights possessed by each citizen. They were not to create these latter rights—their delegated function was merely to defend them against lawless and predatory groups, and most of all against government itself.

So long, and to the extent that our Government adhered to the very spirit and letter of the Constitution, we were a happy and prosperous people, the Mecca of the hopes of the world, and a light set upon a hill. All of our troubles—and they are many—have sprung from our departure into unjust, unlawful, ill-advised, and ruinous experiments, which may have seemed attractive and expedient, but which ran contrary to the defense of life, liberty, and individual property guaranteed to each American citizen in the Constitution.

Such an invasion of life, liberty, and property is now forced upon us in the matter of controls. Inasmuch as they violate the individual rights to unlimited production of consumer goods, subject only to the natural law of supply and demand, substituting totalitarian and unconstitutional flats for the regulation, and sometimes destruction of private property, or the right of the individual to choose the time and place of his market, they are always unsound laws, contrary both to the Constitution and to the natural law of supply and demand.

Bizarre and fantastic reasons are urged for their use; all of them unsound and untrue if measured by the principles of law set forth above. The right to produce and market your product as you will is just as basic as that of begetting children, and preserving the family line, or the right to worship God as you please. To the law and the Constitution;

if they agree not with these, it is because there is no truth in them.

Time and again history has proven there are five milestones upon the highway toward a totalitarian state:

First. Emergency powers granted to the Executive.

Second. Money and exchange control usurped by the Executive, or granted to him.

Third. Conscription, or universal military training in peacetime.

Fourth. Controls of production, marketing, and sometimes destruction of consumer goods.

Fifth. Control of the press, and other media of the exchange of ideas.

Even a cursory examination of our present condition as a suffering state will point to the fact that we have traveled a long way down the broad highway toward a totalitarian state.

There is a tendency in a controlled society to bring into existence a great army of officials feeding and breeding upon paper. It becomes the age-old process of reducing a free nation, nay the palladium of freedom, to serfdom. Under emergency controls—not to mention a system of permanent controls, presently demanded by the Chief Executive—power becomes irresponsible, like a high tension wire cut loose. When individuals in charge of controls may do this or that, merely by signing a paper, the doctrine of collective governmental responsibility collapses, and the limits of departmental authority become blurred, so that no cohesive government or collective authority remains.

An English writer, speaking of the men carrying out controls after the last war said:

The people of Britain accepted controls as uncomplainingly as they had accepted the war. They did not see the enemy who crept upon them behind their backs. Froglike, these little men, charged with the execution of controls, clambered upon their backs and, barnacle-like, they clung when the emergency was over.

Another British writer, speaking of controls, said:

Controls are a knife held at the country's throat, and none may know who shall seize it next. Controls make a vast prison house for free peoples. The peoples in a controlled state are digging their own graves.

And Mr. Churchill said, speaking of controls in England:

They are wholly wrong and evil measures; we need wholly different measures to restore our liberty to live, work, build, and trade.

History and the march of time have shown how prophetic these words were for Britain. But let us not forget that totalitarianism can thrive in any clime, amongst any people, no matter how complete their former freedoms—and it can happen here. Let us see to it that we do not forge our own chains through temporary or permanent controls to carry us the rest of the way toward a militaristic, fascistic power state.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore en-

tered, for 10 minutes on Monday next, October 1, the one hundredth anniversary of the writing of Swanee River, by Stephen Collins Foster.

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### PLACING ON PUBLIC RECORD INFORMATION CONCERNING INCOMES OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 244)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress enact legislation requiring officials in all branches of the Government to place on the public record each year full information concerning their incomes from all sources, public and private. I believe this will be an important step in assuring the integrity of the public service and in protecting Government officials against false and unfounded charges of improper conduct.

The overwhelming majority of the people who are working for the Federal Government in the legislative, judicial, and executive branches are decent, honest, and upright citizens who are doing their very best in the public interest. I believe that the standards of conduct now prevailing in the Government service compare favorably with those of the past and with the standards now prevailing in business and the professions. Nevertheless, it should be our constant aim to improve these standards. As the burdens of the Government increase during this defense period, and more and more citizens enter into business or financial dealing with the Government, it is particularly necessary to tighten up on our regulatory procedures, and to be sure that uniformly high legal and moral standards apply to all phases of the relationship between the citizen and his Government.

In operations as large as those of our Government today, with so much depending on official action in the Congress and in the executive agencies, there are bound to be attempts by private citizens or special interest groups to gain their ends by illegal or improper means. Unfortunately, there are sometimes cases where members of the executive and legislative branches yield to the temptation to let their public acts be swayed by private interest. We must therefore be constantly on the alert to prevent illegal or improper conduct, and to discover and punish any instances of it that may occur.



We must also guard against the danger that the misconduct of a few will result in unwarranted suspicion and distrust of the honesty of all Government officials.

In recent months, there has been something amounting to a deliberate effort to discredit the Government service. Attempts have been made through implication and innuendo, and by exaggeration and distortion of the facts in a few cases, to create the impression that graft and corruption are running rampant through the whole Government.

To my mind the most disturbing feature of the charges and rumors stirred up by these attempts is their effect on the confidence of the American people in their Government and in all the individuals who make up the Government. I am told that people all around the country are getting a mistaken and a distorted impression that the Government is full of evildoers, full of men and women with low standards of morality, full of people who are lining their own pockets and disregarding the public interest.

This is a terrible distortion of the true facts about our Government. It would be tragic if our citizens came to believe it. It would be tragic for the American people themselves to have such an idea about their Government, and it would be a terrible tragedy for all those who serve within the Government. None of us can afford to let the whole body of public officials be given a bad name by accusations, rumors, and sensational publicity tending to smear everybody.

I believe the best thing we can do to spike this effort to discredit Government officials is to place all the facts right on the record. The facts themselves are the best cure for public doubts and uncertainty.

I recommend, therefore, that the Congress promptly enact a statute which will require all full-time civilian presidential appointees, including members of the Federal bench; all elected officers of the Federal Government, including Members of the Congress; and all other top officials and employees of the three branches of the Government—say those receiving salaries of \$10,000 or more, plus flag and general officers of the armed services—to file annually a statement of their total incomes, including amounts over and above their Government salaries, and the sources of this outside income. Consideration should also be given to requiring other Government employees to file such statements if their outside income exceeds a specified amount—perhaps \$1,000 a year. Some items which are not ordinarily counted as income, such as gifts and loans, should be included in the statements filed under this statute. Penalties for willful violation of this statute should be equivalent to those for violation of the laws relating to the filing of income tax returns.

These statements when filed should be made accessible to the public.

Such public disclosure will, in my opinion, help to prevent illegal or improper conduct and at the same time protect Government officers from unfounded suspicions.

The majority of Federal employees have no income of consequence other than their official salaries. Some of our best public servants, on the other hand, do have sizable amounts of outside income. The great public service that is being rendered today by many men who have been successful in business or other forms of endeavor demonstrates that no distinction can be drawn between these two groups in terms of the public good. The disclosure of current outside income, however, will strike at the danger of gifts or other inducements made for the purpose of influencing official action, and at the danger of outside interests affecting public decisions.

A disclosure of all sources of outside income will be of obvious help in tracking down any case of wrongdoing. Furthermore, the mere existence of a requirement that such disclosure be made will act as a deterrent to improper conduct.

If an official of an executive agency knew that he would have to disclose the fact that he accepted a gift or loan from a private company with which he has public business, or if a Member of Congress who is on a committee concerned with a certain industry knew that he would have to disclose the fact that he accepted a fee from a company in that industry, I believe the chances are that such gifts or fees would not be accepted.

Such a disclosure procedure will also serve to protect officials and legislators from widespread misunderstanding on the part of the public. Our citizens will be able to see for themselves that the talk about corruption and enrichment in public office is grossly exaggerated.

As a general rule, I do not like to see public officials, or any other particular group, subjected to rules and requirements which do not apply to the rest of the population. But at the same time, public office is a privilege, not a right. And people who accept the privilege of holding office in the Government, must of necessity expect that their entire conduct should be open to inspection by the people they are serving. With all the questions that are being raised today about the probity and honesty of public officials, I think all of us should be prepared to place the facts about our income on the public record. We should be willing to do this in the public interest, if the requirement is applied equally and fairly to the officials of all three branches of our Government. This is the best protection we can give ourselves and all of our coworkers against the charge of widespread graft and favoritism in the public service.

I know of no other single step that will do so much good so quickly in protecting the reputations of our public servants and at the same time in producing concrete indications of any really questionable practices.

Much the same considerations apply also, I believe, to those people who hold the principal positions of responsibility in our great political parties. Of course, these offices are not Government positions. But those who hold them are necessarily brought into very close contact with the Government. And our major political parties have traditionally been

so much a part of our whole system of government, that those responsible for the conduct of party business are in fact, if not in law, charged with a real public responsibility. For that reason, I would favor including the principal national party officials and employees among those persons required to file annual income statements along the lines I have described.

The legislation I have here recommended should be passed as soon as possible. If action cannot be completed before adjournment of the present session, then I earnestly hope that the Congress will finish the task as soon as it reconvenes. We should lose no time in placing all the facts before the country, and in clearing up those false impressions that are injurious to the proper functioning of our Government.

I believe also that both the Congress and the Executive should continue to search for other means, legislative and administrative alike, to reassure the American people about the high standards of their Government and to make sure that those high standards continue to be maintained by every individual who holds public office.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 27, 1951.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it. The Chair does wish that when Members are going to rise to a question of personal privilege they would give the Chair an opportunity to look over the material they have.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will be very glad to do that when time permits. However, I am certain the Chair is familiar with the precedents in all matters of this nature.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is, but he is not familiar with what the gentleman has in his hand.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is true. Under the usual procedure it is my intention to read the statement, which in my opinion justifies the privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized to state the question of privilege.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. To rise to a question of the privilege of the House, the gentleman must offer a resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. I am aware of the rule and the practice. I have the resolution in my hand.

Mr. RANKIN. If you are going to offer a resolution, that is all right, but if you are not going to offer a resolution you cannot rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of that, as I intimated a moment ago, I am well aware. But again, I thank the gentleman for his consideration. Permit a repetition I have what I consider a proper resolution in my hand.

The SPEAKER. It is a question of whether the resolution is in order. That has not been determined.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker; I rise to a question of a privilege of the House. I have a resolution which I desire to offer but wish, first, to state the facts which justify the privilege.

It appears from page 12098 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, September 26, 1951, that in the other body, a Member of that body from Michigan, among other things, from the floor of that body made the following statement:

Now, Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the allegations and insinuations of the Representative from the Second District of Michigan, Mr. MEADER.

According to the newspaper clippings reaching me from the Republican National Committee, Mr. MEADER and others have charged that the Democratic Party in Michigan is selling jobs in the Post Office Department. That, Mr. President, is what I meant by a political smear. Mr. MEADER is a lawyer. I am surprised that he is reaching conclusions before the evidence is in. He has reached his conclusion on the basis of the fund-solicitation letter plus one letter from a constituent who complains that, as a veteran, he was passed over unlawfully for a postmaster's appointment. I immediately asked Mr. MEADER for the identity of this man.

Mr. MEADER refused to let me know the identity of the man.

Mr. MEADER must be acquainted with the civil-service and post-office laws and regulations governing these matters. He must know that without cause a veteran cannot possibly be passed over by a nonveteran. The rest of his anonymous correspondent's complaint deals with hearsay.

The foregoing language which assails a Member of the House constitutes a breach of privilege. Inasmuch as the House is without authority to itself act to correct the foregoing, I send to the Clerk's desk the following resolution:

#### House Resolution 441

*Resolved*, That the language published in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Wednesday, September 26, 1951, on page 12377, in the report of an address to the Senate by the Senator from Michigan, Mr. MOODY, is improper, unparliamentary, and a reflection on the character of a Member of the House, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. MEADER, and constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Senate and that the Senate be requested to take appropriate action concerning the subject.

Mr. Speaker, the precedent for this action is found in Eighth Cannon's Precedents, page 231, section 2516. From that precedent it appears that on August 18, 1921, a Member of the other body made certain remarks referring, though not by name, to a Member of the House, which reflected upon the House Member's integrity in his representative capacity.

On August 22, following, a question of privilege was raised and a resolution, similar to the one which has been sent to the Clerk's desk, was adopted by the House and a copy was sent to the other body. Subsequently, on a unanimous-consent request in the other body, the matter referred to in the resolution was expunged from the RECORD. The pur-

pose of this resolution, if that be the sense of the Senate, is to call for similar action with reference to the language used yesterday and which, by name, challenged the integrity of the Member of the House from Michigan, Mr. MEADER, in his representative capacity.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that I have referred to a Member of the other body by name, but I followed word for word, except as to identity, a previous resolution and ruling by a former Speaker of the House to which reference has been made. I sent a resolution to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 441

*Resolved*, That the language published in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Wednesday, September 26, 1951, on page 12377, in the report of an address to the Senate by the Senator from Michigan, Mr. MOODY, is improper, unparliamentary, and a reflection on the character of a Member of the House, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. MEADER, and constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Senate and that the Senate be requested to take appropriate action concerning the subject.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard for 1 minute on the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed for a minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to argue this matter. The issue is clear. Argument would only tend to aggravate the situation. My desire is to promote comity between the Senate and the House. My request is that the resolution be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### UNITY OF IRELAND

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 430 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 82) to provide for the unity of Ireland. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 185]

Allen, La.	Elston	Murphy
Anfuso	Fisher	Murray, Wis.
Bailey	Hébert	Patterson
Baker	Heller	Philbin
Bender	Hess	Potter
Bentsen	Hinshaw	Powell
Boggs, Del.	Holifield	Rabaut
Boggs, La.	Howell	Redden
Breen	Irving	Regan
Brown, Ohio	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Busbey	James	Sadlak
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	St. George
Case	Kennedy	Scott, Hardie
Chatham	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Steed
Cooley	King	Stigler
Corbett	Lucas	Taylor
Coudert	McCulloch	Thomas
Crosser	McMillan	Thornberry
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Tollefson
Dawson	Miller, Calif.	Vinson
Deane	Morrison	Wigglesworth
Dorn	Morton	Willis
Doughton	Moulder	Wood, Ga.
Eberhart	Mumma	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 356 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### UNITY OF IRELAND

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY].

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. Pending that I yield myself 5 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order House Resolution 82, the Fogarty resolution. It was reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The purpose of this resolution may be stated simply: It expresses the sense of this House that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

House Resolution 82 is in line with the language and spirit of a resolution adopted by the Sixty-fifth Congress, in 1919, declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live.

The action by the Congress in 1919 recalls the history of the partition of Ireland. That history may be traced to December 14, 1918, when a general election was held in Ireland, under British law, and while a British Army occupied Ireland. In that election the chief issue was whether the Irish, exercising their



right to self-determination proclaimed by the victorious allies in World War I, would declare their Nation independent. The result was an overwhelming majority in favor of independence.

In pursuance of this expression of the national will the elected representatives of the Irish people assembled in Dublin on January 21, 1919, declared Ireland an independent Nation and established a government and legislature.

The British Parliament refused to recognize the right of the Irish people to make laws for their own country. In 1920, the Parliament passed a statute by which the Irish nation was partitioned. No Irishman from any part of Ireland, north or south, voted for that statute. It was enacted by the votes of representatives of English, Scottish, and Welsh constituencies.

To force this unwanted partition on Ireland, the British Government sent the Black and Tans into Ireland. Martial law was declared, and a reign of terrorism launched. The partition was carried out, with the devising of an artificial entity called Northern Ireland—a grouping of six counties with no natural or other logical boundary. Indeed, the choice of the areas for separation from Ireland was dictated by a clear intention to gerrymander election districts.

In considering the resolution before this House, let it be noted that partition was imposed on Ireland by a government outside of, and unrepresentative of the Irish people; that the law of partition was put into effect and enforced by armed troops; that partition has been maintained by British troops of occupation in the separated six counties; that at no time has there been a free and secret plebiscite in the occupied area; that political groups in the separated area which favor partition hold their power only by virtue of gerrymandering of election districts, and finally, that there have been numerous, repeated, and firm expressions in favor of unity by persons living in the separated area.

A united, integrated Ireland would strengthen the free nations of Europe. In the name of the freedoms which we cherish so dearly in our country, this resolution ought to be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] such time as he may require.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] and the chairman and members of the Committee on Rules who have reported the pending resolution which would make in order the immediate consideration by the House of the so-called Fogarty resolution.

I thoroughly agree with the gentleman's splendid statement. The people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live. We should adopt the pending rule so that the Fogarty resolution may be fairly debated and voted upon here today. It expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the Republic of Ire-

land should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary. There is ample precedent for this. About 30 years ago this House adopted a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live. This House over the years has expressed itself with regard to the formation of the Government of Israel as well as of Poland, merely to take two other incidents of precedent for the Fogarty resolution.

Simple justice requires that the 6 northeast counties of the Province of Ulster be joined with the 26 counties which make up the present Irish Government. Ireland was an entire independent nation for centuries and her territorial integrity should be restored. I trust that the House will adopt the pending rule so that we may debate and consider the Fogarty resolution. I shall certainly vote in the affirmative.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous adoption of House Resolution 82. It is an extremely moderate resolution expressing the sense of this House that all of Ireland should vote in any plebiscite on that country's unification. Up till now there has been no such opportunity. It is obvious that the decision respecting a nation's sovereignty should be left to the whole nation and not solely with the part that is sought to be dismembered.

Ireland is a friendly nation to the United States and is one of our oldest friends. Her struggle for complete freedom is, too, one of the oldest in recorded history. No threat, even that of annihilation, could ever deter the people of that island in their centuries old allegiance to democracy and liberty. The name of Ireland and the cause of freedom from oppression are forever entwined in history's annals. No nation can genuinely fight for the freedom of others unless they have proved willing to fight firmly for their own. And Ireland has demonstrated that.

Here today in the House of Representatives we have the opportunity of demonstrating the sincerity of our purposes. We are for freedom all over the world. We are against imperial despotism and against Communist regimentation and aggression. Ireland wants its freedom recognized. She is not threatening to go Communist. She wants to be free of imperial exploitation. In the eyes of the world we would be sullying the purity of our motives if we should fail in this measure of palpable justice in the cause of freedom.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that House Resolution 82 should not be before us for consideration, and I have a firm conviction that the great majority of the membership of the House of Representatives feel the same way.

I make this statement with the realization that the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported it favorably, as well as the Committee on Rules, of which I am a member. I am frank to confess that I was not present when this matter was before the Rules Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted against reporting it. It is now my understanding that a considerable number of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as several members of the Rules Committee, have changed their views and are now opposed to passage.

Undoubtedly those of us who are opposing this resolution will be charged with being unfriendly to the people of Ireland. We will be charged with being enemies of a freedom-loving people. We will be classified as being on the side of tyrants and oppressors. We unquestionably will hear many times about our fight for independence.

From a strictly political standpoint, most likely those of us who are in opposition are on the wrong side. But this transcends political expediency.

What is the question before us? It is strictly this: Should one friendly nation become involved in the internal and political affairs of another friendly nation? I believe not.

It is not often that I am in agreement with the foreign policy of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. Unless someone states with authority to the contrary, we must believe that President Truman and Mr. Acheson are opposed to this resolution. In a previous Congress, the House of Representatives passed a similar resolution. The other body did nothing about it. Is there any reason to believe that should we pass this resolution, the other body would act favorably? Admitting that our actions should not be determined according to what the other body might or might not do, what the President of the United States might or might not do—is it not logical to hold that there should be a mutual understanding before this delicate and dynamic problem should be considered in this body?

I have thoroughly studied the history of the people of Ireland. Few people of European countries have fared so poorly. No wonder so many of them came to America to become outstanding citizens. They have contributed so much to the advancement of their adopted country. If there is any question in the mind of anyone as to the hardships they have endured for centuries under British rule, I call your attention to the testimony of our distinguished majority leader; of our colleagues JOHN FOGARTY, author of this resolution; of DONALD O'TOOLE; of JAMES DELANEY; of KEN KEATING; and others before the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Still I hold that we must remain aloof from the internal and political problems of our friendly nations. Both the people of Ireland and England are our friends. I feel—especially at this momentous time—that we should not enter into their disputes nor the disputes of any of our other mutual friends.

I propound these questions to those favoring this resolution: Do you believe we would be justified in passing a similar resolution regarding France and French Morocco, Great Britain and South Africa, Belgium and the East Indies? Do you believe that any friendly nations should take a similar action affecting the United States and Hawaii, the United States and Puerto Rico?

I sincerely believe, regardless of the admiration that any of us have for the people of Ireland, that this resolution should be defeated. Meddling in the affairs of our mutual friends can bring us nothing but disaster. We must let them settle their own difficulties. We lost the friendship of India, as evidenced by their many votes in the United Nations, because the people of that large country believed we took sides in favor of England in their fight for independence. There is friction in Iran because that country believes we are on the side of England. There is friction in Egypt over our attitude in blockading the Suez Canal. There is friction in Arab countries, in Israel, in Pakistan, in Indochina, in Malaya.

United States influence in Asia is on the wane. Why? Because we, to a greater or lesser degree, interfered with their internal and political problems.

We cannot justify our position in meddling with their affairs while at the same time insisting on the principles of the Monroe Doctrine.

This rule should be defeated.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. The gentleman in his remarks expressed concern as to what the thought of the President and Secretary of State might be on this matter. This is the first time I ever recall the gentleman ever being concerned about that.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I am in agreement with the President of the United States or with the Secretary of State in regard to foreign problems, but I wonder whether there is anyone here with any authority whatsoever who can rise and tell us just how the President of the United States and how the Secretary of State feel in regard to this resolution?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In reference to the question just posed by the gentleman, as I read the resolution I do not see that the President is going to have very much to do with it. The resolution states that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that Ireland be given an opportunity for a complete plebiscite of the whole nation to determine by a majority whether the six northern counties shall be part of the Republic of Ireland. I fail to see where the President would have anything to say about this resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I can say that it is only natural that the President should be interested in anything that affects the country's foreign policy.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. If I understand the gentleman correctly, this is a rather delicate matter and the least discussion we have on it the better it will be for the best interests of all concerned. I quite agree with the gentleman, it is meddling in something that we have nothing to do with. The gentleman thinks that the best thing to do is to have as little discussion as possible and vote down the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the substance of House Resolution 82 involves but a simple expression of sentiment among the Members of this House. It does not even bind the Senate to act or in anyway obligate the Secretary of State or the Chief Executive to affirmative action of any kind. I repeat it is only an expression of our sentiment as Members of the House of Representatives of the United States. That is the least we can do for Ireland.

We have every right and reason, moral and legal, to speak out, to make known these sentiments. There is no need or obligation to consult the President or anyone else as to their views, whatever they may be, whenever we desire to give vent to our feelings. The right of self-determination of peoples by way of a plebiscite is a fundamental and traditional matter. It sustains that traditional and moral concept of our faith in and fairness toward the smaller and oppressed nations. It should serve other nations as a guide.

Mr. Speaker, I favor unreservedly the immediate passage of the rule and of the bill.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I naturally feel some delicacy in appearing before this House in opposition to a rule that comes here in connection with a bill from the Foreign Affairs Committee. However, I think I am duty bound to tell the House my position in the matter.

Upon petition of more than a majority of the committee, a hearing was granted on this House resolution. There is some background that I will not go into. By a majority vote of those present, and there was a quorum present, the resolution was reported favorably after I had voted against it myself. In my opinion, reporting the resolution was a thoughtless and possibly a dangerous thing to do.

After that I did not hear any more about the resolution until someone told me it was coming up before the Rules Committee for consideration. I said that that was the first time, at least since I had been chairman of the committee, that I had known a bill to come before the Rules Committee when neither the chairman nor clerk were informed that the bill was going to be considered there. Now, had I known that this resolution was coming before the Rules Committee

I would have been duty bound to express my opinion. I would have preferred not to do that because the author of this resolution, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and the gentleman who will be in charge of the time on the part of the committee if the rule is adopted, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], are my very dear friends and two of the most able and honorable men in this body. But I could not in conscience appear before the Rules Committee to urge this measure, when all over this world, not only in the Western Hemisphere but everywhere else, we are trying to get the democratic nations together under a banner of strength and harmony to fight the common enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to understand why any group, people who come from Ireland, people who come from England, people who come from France or people who come from somewhere else—and all of our forefathers came from all of these countries—or any minority in this country having roots deep in the old world would not submerge the interests of the old country to the interests of the United States.

This rule, if adopted, will do damage to the United States of America, the country we all love. I am not talking about religious differences between North Ireland and South Ireland. There is not a Member of this House who can attribute to me any intolerance or religious bigotry. But, Mr. Speaker, when people who are sponsoring this rule talk to me about how this resolution will "maintain international peace and security," I say it will do just the opposite. If the people of the six counties of North Ireland are told they must come in whether they want to or not, they will not like it.

Unification of Ireland will disturb peace and security, not maintain it. Northern Ireland will resist by force if necessary, as it has done before. Let us not forget the words of Lord Carson, the Ulster leader, in 1913:

There are not in His Majesty's dominions a more loyal set of men than those who constitute the great community for which we are fighting \* \* \* we may be coerced into submission, but if we are we will be governed as a conquered community and nothing else.

This means simply one thing—strife and unrest if there is a forced unification, which this resolution favors.

Mr. Speaker, much is made here of the principle of self-determination. I approve that principle; and the United States has endorsed it as a policy on many occasions. Those who sponsor this resolution say that is all they are asking for. That may be, but they are asking for "determination, by themselves," not "self-determination." Self-determination means determination by those whose fate is to be settled, not by those who want to recover territory.

What about the days of the past in the Speaker's great State of Texas, during the administration of Andrew Jackson, when Sam Houston was leading the Texans and the question came up whether or not Texas should be included in the Federal Union? Who decided that question? The people of Texas. In this case the people of North Ireland



should decide whether or not they want to be in there.

Let there be self-determination by Southern Ireland that it wants Northern Ireland, and by Northern Ireland that it wants to become a part of a unified Ireland. Any other basis is undemocratic; it is not self-determination but dictation by a numerically more powerful group.

Let us not forget that this question has a history. Just before World War I, Britain tried to give Ireland—all of Ireland—home rule. Gladstone split, and ultimately killed, the once great Liberal Party over this issue. And when the home rule question was being decided, Northern Ireland let it be known that she would resist by force an Irish rule from Dublin by Irishmen for all Ireland. Does anyone doubt what the result of the so-called plebiscite included in this resolution would be?

This resolution is an interference in the internal affairs of Great Britain, and none can deny it. Should we adopt such a resolution in violation of the principle of noninterference for which the United States stands? I say we should not. This resolution would compromise that principle in a situation where the United States has nothing whatever to gain. What have we to gain if we do not endorse this unwarranted interference in British affairs? We are now engaged in a common defense effort where we need common effort and mutual confidence. These are essential to the North Atlantic Treaty operations in which we are placing a great deal of our treasure. Ireland has not seen fit to join this effort; Britain is exerting her utmost.

If we want to be fair, if we want self-determination of peoples, if we do not want to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery of the NATO powers or put a roadblock between us and Great Britain in our activities in a common cause, then let us vote down this rule. If we vote this rule, if we do this unreasonable thing, the next thing that the British Parliament should do is tell the Congress of the United States, "Tend to your own business."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, some of my best friends at home are the Sons of St. Patrick and the Shamrock Club. My youngest brother's nickname is Pat. I have Irish blood in me. I would like to see Ireland united someday. But I am opposed to this resolution. This is a sense resolution, saying "it is the sense of this House" and so forth, but it does not make sense.

The resolution states that "international peace and security require" minority rule in North Ireland. In the name of unity we are going against democracy and against self-determination. Under this resolution, if a majority of the Ulster men in the six northern counties did not want to go into the Irish Republic they would be yanked in because obviously, an overwhelming majority in the Irish Republic would vote them in. So this provides for minority rule, that we op-

pose at home and abroad. That does not make sense.

This resolution states that "international peace and security require" a united Ireland. There is no assurance that Ireland, united or not, would add to international security or to our own security. Even though Ireland sat out World War II as a neutral, we took them into the Marshall plan for recovery from World War II and up to June they got \$146,200,000. However, when they were invited into the North Atlantic arrangement they did not come in.

We have no assurance that Ireland will help us and the free countries in this deadly struggle that may lie ahead. I asked Hon. John Costello, the head of the Committee for a United Ireland, about this and he said he had no such assurance from the Government of Ireland or any official of the government. So to attempt to tie this up with international security does not make sense.

Thirdly, who is this aimed at besides our beloved Irish-American friends in this country? Not to the Republic of Ireland. It is aimed at the government of North Ireland, which happens to be the United Kingdom, a friendly ally. Addressing such gratuitous, meddlesome advice to the British Parliament—now, let us be frank—will that help or harm the cause of Irish union? Unless the British nature has changed in recent weeks, such a gratuitous piece of advice will ultimately hurt the cause of Irish unity, because the British Parliament will resent it. If they have any spunk, they will say, "You tend to your own business," just as we would say to them, "You tend to your own business," if they attempted to tell us what we should do with Puerto Rico, Alaska, Hawaii, or other parts of the United States. So that part of it does not make sense.

Since this sense resolution does not make sense, and does not help the cause of Irish unity, I oppose the resolution and because this is a case where least said soonest mended, I hope the rule is voted down.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may insert their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Ireland was a nation, complete and undivided, more than 1,500 years ago.

It is a nation today by reason of its geographic unity, its national language, its special culture, its own code of laws. In fact, its identity is more definite than many other nations because it is completely surrounded by water.

As long as Britain maintains its occupation of the six northern counties in violation of its own pledge, Ireland suffers; Britain is mistrusted and despised; and our leadership of the free world is compromised.

The United States must take the lead in bringing about the unification of Ireland by our unanimous support of House Resolution 82, which calls for a vote on this issue by all of the people of Ireland.

There is no doubt whatsoever as to the result.

That mandate, carried out, will right a great wrong and will strengthen the community of interest which must bring the free peoples of Ireland, Britain, the United States, and other nations closer together and help us to overcome the danger that threatens us from another direction.

The British made several efforts during World War I to secure Irish acceptance for some plan of dismemberment or partition. These failed. On the 14th of December, 1918, a general election was held in which the whole of Ireland took part. The issue was whether Ireland, exercising the right to self-determination proclaimed by the victors in World War I would declare her independence and set up a national legislature. The result was overwhelmingly in favor of national independence. Seventy-eight of the electoral divisions declared for independence and only 23 against, a more decisive verdict than we obtain in national elections held in the United States.

It was then that Britain resorted to force in order to cancel the freely expressed will of the people. But the alien army of occupation was driven out of the 26 southern counties. Only in the remaining one-sixth of Ireland were the British able to maintain the fiction of partition and even in that corner they have had to employ every devious device to hold their position.

No matter how British diplomacy twists and turns, it cannot explain away the revealing truth that the British statute which partitioned Ireland and set up a separate government in the northeast had no mandate and no approval from any party in Ireland.

The present Labor Government of Britain, whose members at the time of partition pledged themselves to recognize Ireland's right to decide her own destiny, have betrayed their solemn promise.

I am confident that the rank and file of the British people favor complete independence for their neighbor, just as they themselves wanted and won freedom from their former masters.

One of the purposes of this resolution is to convey our sentiments to the British people so that they will demand that their government make good on its pledge to emancipate Ireland from the last vestige of imperialism.

Partition poses a grave threat to the unity of the free world. It warns subject people everywhere that they cannot place their full faith and confidence in our cause until we make democracy work better.

What do you say, Mr. Attlee?

How about it, Mr. Churchill?

Delay in settling this problem is preventing Ireland from adhering to the Atlantic Pact, and in the United States is throwing 20,000,000 citizens of Gaelic origin into isolationism.

The British pulled out of India where the stakes were much greater. They lost monopoly, but gained good will.

Why, then, do they cling to their indefensible position in Northern Ireland, thereby jeopardizing the unity of the

Western World and weakening the friendship of the United States and Britain?

Time is running out on stubbornness, deception, and delay.

The federation of world democracy needs the faith and courage of the Irish people.

We in the United States recognize this fact.

Through the medium of House Resolution 82 we ask the Government of Great Britain to withdraw from Ireland as soon as possible and acknowledge the complete sovereignty of the Irish people.

This is the British Government's opportunity, before it is too late, to take the right and honorable action that will prove that she is a sincere and worthy ally in the defense of those basic liberties which unite our peoples.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is singularly appropriate for the Congress of the United States to take action on behalf of the Republic of Ireland, since throughout the entire history of our own country we have had strong ties with the Irish people and have constantly demonstrated our support for their legitimate desire for free, democratic and independent self-government.

The brave struggle of the Irish people, which has been climaxed after 700 years by full recognition of their sovereignty in the Republic of Eire, still continues, however, so long as the Emerald Isle is divided and a portion of the Irish Nation is bound against the wishes of the majority to an alien power. Simple justice demands that all Ireland be one. There can be no question but that some day Ulster will be united with the rest of the Republic. It is the fervent hope of the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY, and of those of us who support his resolution that we can speed up the arrival of that day.

Ireland's sons and daughters have for generations contributed to the main stream of American life. Many of our Presidents and leaders in all walks of life trace their ancestry to the Irish homeland. This country has always aided the causes of Irish freedom and played a substantial part in the events since World War I which have resulted in today's Irish Republic. We have thus attempted to repay our debt to the Irish people. We cannot, however, consider that debt fully repaid unless we do everything within our power to bring all 32 counties under the banner of the republic so that all Ireland can be united and free of any foreign yoke for all time to come.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged and honored to speak in support and urge the adoption of this resolution calling upon the British authorities to extend simple justice to Ireland and the Irish people, by permitting them to have a unified nation.

To begin with, I should like to remind you, my colleagues, that 6 of Ireland's

32 counties were partitioned off by the British in 1920 and given a separate government. Shortly after coming into existence in 1921, the Northern Government declared a state of emergency and suspended all civil liberties; this emergency has now lasted over 29 years. Even in this modern jumbled world such prolongation of an emergency, I think you will agree, seems over-extended and requires explanation.

Authoritative and unbiased historians testify this territory of Northern Ireland was carefully chosen so as to be large enough to make it possible to exist under a separate government but not wide enough to enable the most vigorous minority ever to obtain a majority. The absurdity of this geographical division is clear when we realize the fact that Malin Head, in Donegal, the most northerly point in Ireland, was included in Southern Ireland. If that is not an example of gerrymandering on a large scale, I would like to know what is.

At this point, I feel it in order to place in the RECORD, for your attention, an evaluation of Northern Ireland which was made, not by Irishmen but, by Englishmen. In 1935, an observer was sent from London to Belfast by the British National Council for Civil Liberties, to report on conditions there. The following is taken from his text on the manner in which the northern government operates under the Special Powers Act, and I quote:

Through the use of the special powers, individual liberty is no longer protected by law, but is at the arbitrary disposition of the executive. The abrogation of the rule of law has been so practiced as to bring the freedom of the subject into contempt.

The Northern Irish Government has used special powers toward securing the domination of one particular political faction and, at the same time, toward curtailing the lawful activities of its opponents. The driving of legitimate movements underground into illegality, the intimidating or branding as lawbreakers of their adherents, however innocent of crime, has tended to encourage violence and bigotry on the part of the Government's supporters.

The Northern Irish Government, despite its assurances that special powers are intended for use only against lawbreakers, has frequently employed them against innocent and law-abiding people, often in humble circumstances, whose injuries, inflicted without cause or justification, have gone uncompensated and disregarded.

This same state of affairs appears to be still going on and Britain has not once taken action to stop it. Is it then not fair for us to ask, by way of adoption of this resolution, the British Government to do something to remove this continuing injustice which, for all these years, British-supported partition has inflicted upon Ireland. No one who examines the map of the Atlantic can fail to see the commanding position that Ireland holds in any scheme of Atlantic defense. If we request Ireland to take her place with us, and other liberty-loving nations, in defending the freedom of the world, is Ireland then not entitled to demand some proof of good faith from her associates. What proof can the British Empire give so long as it continues to maintain in

power a government that suppresses a minority. Can any one say that Ireland's reluctance to join a common defense system is unreasonable if one of the partners in such an association is engaged in active injustice against Ireland itself. Any thought of the Irish Government lacking in international understanding must be rejected in the light of her honorable and vigorous record in that regard.

Standing firm on its spiritual heritage, the Irish nation has in our times achieved a new birth of freedom. There are those of us who can very well remember when such a birth of freedom for Ireland seemed a most remote and hopeless dream; yet it has happened. The assistance of Ireland's sons to every other nation in carving a destiny of freedom spotlights the pages of world history. Today we are engaged in a terrible struggle against tyranny for the preservation of human dignity and Christian ideals. I know that the sons of Ireland and the Irish nation will stand side by side with America in trying to bring peace to a troubled universe.

I earnestly hope Ireland, whose brave sons gave their lives to fulfill our American dream of independence, may be accorded our support in achieving her ambition of the ages, to be like America, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. I heartfully urge you, my colleagues, to join with me in voting in favor of this just resolution.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Fogarty resolution deserves the support of every believer in the principles of free government. There is no logical reason why one rule of freedom should be applied to other countries and another applied to Ireland. The historic basis for complete Irish autonomy and for the establishment of a totally free Irish Government embracing sovereignty over the whole of Ireland is unquestionable.

I will not recite the centuries of misrule and oppression which the people of Ireland have suffered as a result of tyrannical foreign domination. This pathetic story is so well known by every schoolboy and so well remembered by every Irishman that it needs no repetition.

I desire, however, to present a few incontrovertible facts concerning the pending question of partition. The present territorial arrangement which was effected in 1920 separated the six northern counties of Ireland from the rest of the nation and set up this new northern government as a puppet state for England. That is not all. The ancient and historic province of Ulster was ruthlessly partitioned against the almost unanimously expressed wishes of the peoples residing therein. Even the prominent Ulster leader, Sir Edward Carson, opposed this indiscriminate carving up of the northern counties.

Testimony is abundant from the utterances of Ulster leaders that the people of Ulster never wanted partition but that it was forced upon them against their will in 1920. This fact is more forcefully borne out by the fact that not a single Irish vote was cast for the Parti-



tion Act of 1920 in the British Parliament. The members of the Ulster Tory Party and the Nationalists in Ulster and other parts of the island were vigorously opposed to this measure. Thus the dismemberment of Ireland was forced through the British Parliament over the opposition of all the Irish leaders and against the express will of the Irish people, and a system of shameless gerrymandering was written into the act which, in effect, provided for minority control of Northern Ireland.

Fair-minded persons will agree that this was a ruthless and cruel way indeed to try to make up for the centuries of enslavement, oppression, and persecution visited upon the Irish by arbitrary laws and dictatorial edicts which had deprived an overwhelming majority of the Irish people of their God-given political, economic, and religious freedom. Irish history is replete with diabolical plots and merciless persecution designed to suppress a great and historic people whose unprecedented struggle for freedom is such an inspiring story. Every type of deceit, fraud, bribery, and coercion was practiced by English overlords to break the spirit of the Irish, all to no avail. They denied them basic human rights, they tumbled down their miserable shacks over their heads, they deprived them of education and the right to practice their religion, they visited them with cold-blooded and callous mass starvation just as inhuman as the Hitler gas chambers, they ousted them and their children from their homes, they denied them the right to till their land and fish their streams, they violated their women, they wrongfully jailed, shot, and hung them but they were never able to quench the fierce passion for liberty and freedom which burned in the Irish heart. Few students of history can fail to be stirred by the patriotism and courage of Robert Emmett, the young islanders, the Feinans, by the skill, ability, and determination of the great Daniel O'Connell, by the sterling leadership of Michael Davitt, Charles Stewart Parnell, and many other great Irish leaders who worked and fought for their country.

The struggle for a home-rule bill recognizing elementary free rights was long and bitter and characterized by bigotry, hatred, and inhumane treatment that the world has seldom experienced.

The partition of Ireland was conceived in fraud and carried out in deceit. Premier Asquith stated at the time that only four counties would be subject to partition and that their exclusion would be limited to a period of 5 years at the end of which they would be united with the Irish National Parliament.

The Sinn Fein movement led by some of the ablest and wisest statesmen of the time united Ireland and Irishmen as never before behind the doctrine of a completely free and undivided Irish Republic. This group was not satisfied with broken promises and pledges that were never kept. Arrayed against the might and power of the great British Empire then at its peak of pomp, majesty, and strength, these men and women fearlessly proclaimed the Irish Re-

public and as one prominent writer has said "baptized it in their young heroic blood." This movement found and developed leaders from every class and creed who were willing to die for a free Ireland and who were more powerful in promoting their dream of freedom in death than in life, for from their selfless sacrifices the present Irish Government arose. We all remember the story of the Black and Tans and the unspeakable outrages which they committed against a small people whose only offense was that they sought to breathe the air of freedom. We can hardly bring ourselves to believe that in a modern age any responsible government, small or large, would launch virtually a pogrom against a people but that is just what happened. The Irish people during the Black and Tan period were visited with the kind of devilish mass destruction that later was to decimate so many of our beloved Jewish brethren under the Hitler regime. It is a curious but undeniable fact that throughout a large part of human history the persecution of the Irishmen and the Jew has gone hand in hand and it is not hard to find the answer because both of these great peoples are lovers of freedom, creators, workers, and builders. You will find their sons blazing the trail of leadership in every field of human endeavor and naturally throughout the ages this fact has kindled the sparks of envy and hatred, of mediocrity and bigotry, of people who seek to secure leadership, whether political or economic, through favoritism, nepotism, and the invalid claims of a ruling caste rather than through merit and ability.

Though it promised to do so under article 12 of the Anglo-Irish Treaty, the British Government never conducted a fair and just plebiscite on the partition question. Instead, that Government repudiated its agreement and moved to set up a separate minority parliament in Ulster.

Ireland and the free world are much indebted to the great Irish statesman and leader, the brilliant and indomitable Eamon DeValera who declared concerning the Anglo-Irish Treaty with clarity and unimpeachable logic that—

We deny that any section of our people can give away the sovereignty or alienate any part of this nation's territory. If this generation should be base enough to give them away, the right to win them back remains unimpaired for those to whom the future will bring the opportunity.

This language sounds like Abraham Lincoln in his effort to prevent the dissolution of our great and beloved American Republic and to preserve a united and undivided America.

The British Government has repeatedly resorted to fraud, to stirring the fires of bigotry between creeds and to direct political chicanery such as gerrymandering and undemocratic arrangements respecting elections in the six northern counties. The county of Tyrone is a good example of this chicanery where a Nationalist majority of about 70,000 votes can under the arrangement elect only 12 representatives while the

Tory minority of about 57,000 can elect 23. The city of Derry is probably the most pronounced and outrageous example of fraud, dishonesty, and political skullduggery. In that city in order to prevent the Nationalists from electing a national representative the city itself was redistricted. Part of the city was actually left out of the city, believe it or not. To the remaining part 8 miles of countryside were added in order to include enough Tory votes to overcome the Nationalist majority still left in the divided city. As a result, notwithstanding the overwhelming majority of the Nationalists within its confines Derry City was able to elect a Tory representative.

More than that with the approval of the British Government the franchise laws were arbitrarily altered in 1946. Individual property owners were given more than one vote while citizens in low-income brackets were deprived of their vote. At the same time Tory leaders cynically boasted that the law was being passed for the purpose of preventing the Nationalists from ever securing political control of that territory including the counties of Fermanagh and Tyrone. This act was a brazen willful denial of democratic rights to the inhabitants of the six counties.

Nor has the experience of the Irish been any better under the present Labor government with its pious professions of concern for the underdog, the underprivileged and oppressed. In the Ireland Act of 1949 that British Labor Government inserted an arbitrary provision declaring that "in no event will Northern Ireland or any part thereof cease to be part of His Majesty's dominion and of the United Kingdom without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland."

Even more amazing is the abatement of civil liberty which has occurred in the northern counties during recent years. Under the Special Powers Act of the Northern Parliament, individual liberty is no longer protected by law. Elementary personal rights are flouted. Citizens may be arrested without the preference of any charges against them. Citizens may be imprisoned without trial, households may be searched without warrant, property may be seized without due process of law. The British National Council for Civil Liberties and a British Commission have repudiated and denounced these violations of the fundamental right of supposedly free citizens.

In 1949 causal gestures were made to withdraw some of the tyrannical regulations but others still remain in effect. The acts themselves have not been repealed. General power still resides in the Minister of Home Affairs to revive and apply of his own will the pernicious regulations which were revoked and, in this way the minority Ulster Tory Party is able to keep itself in power and to prevent the formation of an opposition party by Protestant citizens who disagree with them. The present Labor Party in England is solidly sustaining this tyrannical government.

At the same time Nationalists and Irish Catholics in the six counties have been visited with a brazen and persistent campaign of religious bigotry. They have been excluded from civil-service positions. They have been rendered subject to the penal laws; they have been ruthlessly boycotted socially, commercially, and from employment. Heroic war veterans have been denied positions in the civil service.

A fair study of what has been happening in Ulster in the past 20 or 30 years shows without a doubt that such tyranny does not and could not exist in any other place in the civilized world outside of Soviet Russia and its dominions.

By way of contrast, the management of the Irish Republic has been characterized by full recognition of civil and religious rights, privileges, and liberties. Freedom and equality are watchwords of the National Irish Government.

I think there is no parallel anywhere of such tyranny, and of such repression of the basic rights of free men. The British Government has allowed and is allowing a small minority of Ulster Tories to block the national will of the Irish people. At least 80 percent of Ireland is opposed to partition. Thirty and one-half of Ireland's 32 counties are opposed to it. Forty Ulster Tories, many of whom were elected under the shameful gerrymander system, are allowed to block a completely undivided Irish Republic and the will of 159 other representatives who speak for the overwhelming majority of the Irish people is overriden.

¶ This is not democracy but rather the negation of it. It is a sham and a mockery, cruel jest upon the hopes and aspirations of a noble people and a flagrant repudiation of the principles of freedom and representative government. There is not one solid strong argument for the continuance of partition. The Irish Nation has always been one entity, one whole and undivided nation up to the time of the nefarious arbitrary partition. Irishmen of every section, of every blood strain, of every creed and religion have stood together for centuries in defense of their homeland and in developing its resources and in enriching its culture, tradition, and institutions. The province of Ulster itself has prominently shared in the glorious accomplishments of the Irish people. It is in that section where the immortal St. Patrick established his first See, where Wolfe Tone, John Mitchell, Thomas Clark, and other heroes of Ireland forwarded the cause of freedom.

I can see no valid reason why our Government which has shown so much tender solicitude for other nations seeking to unite and liberate their people should not promptly and vigorously move in behalf of the Irish Nation. In fact, there are most abundant and most eloquent reasons why it should. Our own great country is much indebted to Ireland and the Irish people. Men of Irish blood have been in the vanguard of every American war. History is replete with their deeds of valor, their sacrifices for America. Our civil and re-

ligious life, our educational and political systems, our marts of trade and commerce, our sanctuaries of art, literature and law, all our great cultural institutions have drawn liberally upon the blood and upon the brains of our Irish citizens whose loyalty to God, to America and to the cause of freedom has been and will be an ever shining light and an invincible shield of inspiration for those who would know the ways of good citizenship and how best to preserve the blessed heritage of America. Our Government should have no hesitancy, in my opinion, in calling upon the British Government at an early date to take action long overdue in behalf of and for the relief of the oppressed Irish Nation, to take immediate steps to repeal the Ireland Act of 1949 and the infamous Partition Act of 1920.

Such a move by the British Government at this time would do more to bring unity, enthusiasm, and the spirit of militancy into the defense of the free world and democratic institutions than all the Marshall plans that could be devised. I hope and urge with every ounce of my being that our own great Government will be prompted to move to these ends in the very near future.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the Fogarty resolution in its relationship to Ireland sets forth the position and the policy of our country that has been adhered to wherever the question has raised itself in relation to other peoples and countries since the establishment of constitutional government in the United States. It expresses the sense of the House of Representatives in relation to the right of the people of Ireland as a whole to pass upon the question of the unification of Ireland. Our country, even in its infancy, recognized this right in other people of self-determination. It has been a fundamental policy of our Government and one that we have never departed from and have consistently adhered to in relation to other nations and the right of the people of other nations to freely determine their right of determination. There is no question but what Ireland is one geographical unit. There is no question but what the Republic of Ireland is, and of right, one that should be an integrated and solidified nation. Its natural limits are the ocean and seas that surround it. Any division within it based upon an arbitrary demarcation of contiguous units as small as the Irish counties is unnatural, unhistoric, and particularly when imposed from without, completely unjustified. It seems to me that the pending resolution is a proper one for the House of Representatives to pass; that the facts relating to Ireland justify it and, above all, it is consistent with the time-honored policy of our own Government.

Partition is the sole remaining issue which is a source of contention within the natural boundaries of Ireland.

Disregarding all other factors that cry out against this unjustified and unnatural partition, from the defense angle alone, not only from the immediate but from the long-range angle of a united Ireland with the resultant friendly and cordial relations that are bound to exist

between the two countries, would be a strengthening influence to England's defense and to the defense of Ireland, would fit definitely into the national interest of our own country and make a marked contribution to the defense of the free nations of the world and toward the ultimate peace we seek.

The pending resolution, in substance, if adopted, which I strongly urge, expresses the opinion of the House of Representatives that a plebiscite among the people of all of Ireland should be held on this vital question—the unification of Ireland.

The people of all of Ireland should have the right and the opportunity through a referendum or a plebiscite to pass upon the unification of all of Ireland, thereby enabling them to determine whether or not the homogeneity of the Republic of Ireland should become a political and a territorial fact.

The principle of self-determination for the people of all of Ireland is involved in this resolution. It is our sense that it should apply to the people of Ireland in this important and vital question. We are justified in expressing our opinion with the same vigor as we have advocated self-determination for other nations before and following World War I and before and following World War II.

The principle of self-determination is one of the basic policies of our country for other nations, particularly small nations, and it has been one of our basic policies during our entire constitutional history.

If a resolution was pending in this body under similar conditions relating to some other country, I would support it. I support this resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution which, if it passes, would be an important step forward toward the unification of Ireland. It would initiate action that would do much to end an ancient injustice and is in accordance with the traditional American support of self-determination.

Ireland's fight for national unity and independence is over 700 years old. It is a fight that cannot be considered won until the 6 counties of the north are reunited with the 26 counties that now comprise Eire.

A free, united, integrated Ireland would provide an important bastion for the defense of the west, and would contribute to the strategic security of the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in these anxious days when the Western World is struggling for political independence I believe it is fitting that we should unanimously approve the Fogarty resolution, House Resolution 82, pertaining to the unification of Ireland.

Recent world events have given evidence of the importance of permitting peoples of a common descent to establish their unity and to determine their choice of government. The United States of America has shone as a beacon of light on the path of democratic progress in various countries throughout the world. By endorsing the Fogarty resolution the Congress will demonstrate the interest of all Americans in eliminating



the suppression of the six northern counties of Ireland.

The maintenance of an army of occupation by England in northern Ireland has been against the express interests of the Irish people as oppressive, wasteful, and tyrannical. The people of Ireland believe in the principles of democracy and have shown that they have not been afraid to give their lives for the unity and independence of their land. It is unfair to expect the Republic of Ireland to send her sons to defend Europe against aggression, time and again, while British troops and special police are crushing liberty and democracy in the northeast corner of Ireland. There is no logical explanation for the classification of Ireland to the north and the south when the desires of the inhabitants of both of these areas could express their opinion of this separation in a free plebiscite. A united Ireland would be a great bulwark of the west in its worldwide struggle with Soviet imperialism. The Government of Ireland has already announced that it would gladly join the Atlantic Pact if partition were removed. Instead of a small, sullen ally, we would have a large and enthusiastic free nation cooperating fully with the west in the defense of our way of life. Everything we know about this nation and the way free men behave should convince us that we would have a most dependable ally in a strategic part of the world if the sore of partition were removed and if the Irish people has representation as an equal in the pact of western nations.

Passage of the Fogarty resolution would be a challenge to Great Britain to show her good faith in democracy and freedom by submitting this issue to a plebiscite of all the people of Ireland.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it will, indeed, be a privilege to cast a vote in support of this rule. While I have not canvassed any of my colleagues, I am certain that all of the sons of Aaron will be happy to join with the sons of Erin in supporting this resolution. In fact, I am sure that all of us will be happy to have an opportunity to cast a vote in support of the principles enunciated in this resolution.

We are spending millions of dollars telling the world about our democratic way of life and how they can follow it. The adoption of this resolution is but one more step in this same direction, except that it will cost us nothing to do it.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, this tenderness for the feelings of England which I have observed during the debate today arouses no sympathy from me. Neither does the argument that the United States should not inject itself into a controversy over partition of Ireland at a critical time in world affairs. If at the time that England began her exploitation of colonial possessions, and if at the time that England wrung one-sided trade and development concessions from poverty-stricken and backward nations such as Iran, there had been some power in this world to stop England and turn her from her greedy course we would not now be confronted with a great many of the situations which make these times so critical throughout

the political world. England's sins have found her out. For us to sit back and refuse to take a stand in opposition to one of her gravest sins, the enforced partition of a sovereign nation will only prostitute us in the eyes of those peoples who are teetering on the brink between democracy and communism.

If the United States, the greatest of the democratic nations, now emphatically and vigorously condemns the still imperialistic policies of Britain in the case of Ireland, it may well serve as a shot in the arm to the cause of worldwide democracy. If, instead, we refuse to take action leading to the unification of Ireland, we will be in the position of talking out of both sides of our mouths at once, and those nations who look to us for leadership cannot be blamed for taking a cynical attitude toward the United States claim that she supports the principle of self-determination in the government of nations. A people enslaved care little whether their masters carry the hammer and sickle or the British lion as their standard.

We did not hesitate to commit our resources and the lives of our young men where the partition and possible destruction of an independent Korea was concerned. Why should we hesitate at a far less drastic measure to end the trespass of the invader in Ireland? More than once we have intervened to guarantee the establishment and continued existence of an independent Poland. Are we content to see a part of Ireland kept in exactly the same position as Poland now finds herself—a subject nation? The United States bent every effort to support and encourage the setting up of a homeland for the newest and the oldest of nations—Israel. In the process we had to overcome the opposition of the British Empire, afraid that her domination of the Near East would be endangered. The imperialism of Britain in the Arab world has now exploded into an upheaval threatening the peace of the whole world. Will we be pouring oil on those troubled waters if we tacitly support the same sort of policy applied to the Irish?

Mr. Speaker, I submit that favorable action on this resolution today will strengthen rather than weaken our hand. Aside from the impact on the rest of the world we must consider that in any future war Ireland, by virtue of its geographic situation, will occupy a most strategic spot. Ireland has thus far refused to cooperate in the North Atlantic alliance while Britain occupies a part of her soil. Unification of Ireland would remove that obstacle and bring her wholeheartedly into the community of democratic nations under the North Atlantic Pact. That step alone would add immeasurably to the democratic defense organization. These are all arguments of expediency. On moral grounds there can be no question that Ireland has a right to dictate her own destiny, with not so much as one grain of her soil under British rule. The right to self determination, upon which the whole principle of democratic rule rests, should be granted to Ireland at once. She has clearly defined boundaries, a clearly defined history, a homogeneous

population, the same language, and a burning determination to be completely free.

Let me sum up the reasons upon which the desire for unification of Ireland is based: First, ending the partition would remove the only remaining point of friction between Ireland and Great Britain and would contribute to the unification of the democratic cause; second, unification would be an aid to the defense of the Western World by bringing Ireland into full cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty nations; third, the two parts of Ireland, by mutually aiding each other's economy, would, if unified, add a strong new nation to the anti-Communist bloc; and, fourth, but not least, Ireland has the clearest of moral rights to be one nation, entirely free.

In the face of these facts there should be no question about the vote on this resolution. I ask for overwhelming support for the rule which will bring the question of unification of Ireland to the floor of the House for full debate.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to support House Resolution 82 which will give the people of Ireland the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live.

The partition of Ireland was brought about by action of a government that was not representative of the Irish people and has been enforced by armed troops. It is hoped that this partition will be ended with the establishment of a united, integrated Ireland.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those Members of the House who support the rule granted to bring before us for consideration the Fogarty resolution—House Resolution 82. Eventual passage of the resolution will be in confirmation of the high principle on which American foreign policy has been based down through the years.

The Fogarty resolution declares that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland, "unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary." In a word, this resolution declares once more the right of small nations to determine for themselves the form of government which they desire. Once that declaration has been made by the majority of all the people of that nation, then it should be binding upon all the people resident within its territorial limits.

Often the exact boundaries of any given nation may be subject to some dispute, although the general area in which a separate national group reside may be rather well defined. In the case of Ireland, however, the exact boundaries of the national territory are clear since the country occupies an island cut off from all other peoples by the waters of the sea. When the demand for self-government by the Irish people became so insistent that it could not much longer be refused, Great Britain conceived the idea of partitioning Ireland into two separate areas for the sole purpose of maintaining at least a part of their imperial control in Ireland, with the hope that someday they might regain full control of all Ireland.

If one believes in the democratic concept of government and believes in the right of small nations to govern themselves, then one cannot but support this resolution today. The Irish people in the 1918 elections expressed their democratic choice of an independent government, when they elected 73 Republican candidates as against 26 Unionists and but 6 Parliamentarians. The Parliamentary Party had declared for a home rule form of government under British dominion, while the Unionists favored complete British control. The Parliamentarians were reduced from 80 seats to 6 while the Unionists polled only about 20 percent of the vote. Never in the history of parliamentary governments had so overwhelming a majority declared itself in favor of a single party despite the fact that this election was held under British control, with 47 of the successful Republican candidates in jail, and the campaign activities of all of the Republican candidates hindered and opposed. Nevertheless, this small minority made up of the Unionists and Parliamentarians thwarted the wishes of the majority by the establishment of a separate government in Northern Ireland with the sanction of the British Parliament.

To acknowledge the right of a minority to secede from the rest of a nation, or to permit a small percentage of a people to dominate the course of a whole nation is contrary to all democratic concepts of government. We denounce the right of the Communists to impose their form of government on the peoples of Poland or Rumania. Why then should we condone the same offense when perpetrated by Great Britain? It is easy for us to condemn what our enemies do, but it may require some statesmanship to call the attention of our friends and allies to the fact that they have failed to take any corrective measures with regard to the Irish problem. I am sure that no Member of this body is so lacking in courage as to hesitate to vote in favor of this resolution merely because it questions the continuance of British misrule in Ireland and urges a national referendum to determine specifically the wishes of the entire Irish nation regarding the government of their country. No more democratic method could be employed than to have the voters in a free election individually express their preference in regard to the jurisdiction of the Irish Republic in governing the full territory of Ireland.

American foreign policy, as clearly defined by President Truman in a recent message to Congress, supports and favors "the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. \* \* \* It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." This policy must be given universal application and applied specifically and directly to the situation in Ireland with the same degree of forcefulness and effectiveness we utilized in giving aid and comfort to Great Britain in her struggle to keep Greece inde-

pendent and free from Communist control.

The long-standing Irish problem should once and for all be settled—a settlement which would bring an end to the unnatural division between two parts of Ireland. The door would then be open for Ireland to become an active and helpful participant in the North Atlantic Pact and one of the bulwarks of democracy in the world.

I urge adoption of the rule.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the short time given to me, I hope to explain my support of this rule.

In speaking of Ireland, I would like to dwell on the path of Irish history and call to mind the Kings of Tara's Hall, or Brian Boru and the Battle of Clontarf, or pay tribute to the scholars of Ireland, but time will not permit.

The treasury of Ireland has been indeed heavily drawn upon for the endowment of western civilization. It will never be forgotten that when darkness engulfed the minds and hearts of men, and the lamps of learning were blown out by the fierce winds of barbarian invasion and shattered by ignorance, the only light, except for the beacon of the Holy Faith, that the eyes of man could see and finally take bearings by was the single, strong flame which was nourished and kept alive on that little green isle set in the vastness of the ocean waters. So powerful was this flame, and zealous its monastic guardians, that no assault could cause it to flicker or to sink, and it burns today in every achievement of the Western World that is good and true and beautiful, and it casts its challenging brilliance even upon the far-flung steppes and tundras of Russia.

I could dwell upon the priceless substantial contributions that the Irish have brought to these shores of our beloved America, and the part they have played in every field of endeavor which has been for the development and permanence of this great Nation. Irish names come to mind from every decade of our history and from every quarter of the land and from every bit of halloved ground, far-flung throughout the world, wherein rest the bodies of our heroic American dead.

However, I must speak on the resolution before us today. I believe that the passage of this resolution will express a positive hope to the peoples of the world. Members of this Congress know with what eagerness the underprivileged nations of the world are watching us. We of the free world are fighting to uphold our ideal for a just and peace-loving world. We, as leaders of the free world have the right to express our beliefs and our hopes to any nation, or to come to the defense of the rights of any people who look to us for help. We have the right to expect our allies to live up to the principles upon which rest the common goal and welfare of the free world. Our lack of expression of our ideals may mean that other races of people who need our help are hindered from turning to us until it is too late for us to render the assistance they need. Examples of this may be found in the situations existing in India, Indochina, and Iran.

The people of the world are confused. They do not understand how a Nation who severed its connections with a mother country can now assist, help, and support that imperial power. In their eyes, we are alined to imperialism. We are alined to imperial powers who have refused over the years to grant the rights and the dignity to their colonial possessions. It is expedient to help free nations, particularly when the world is engaged in a struggle which is a testing ground to prove whether or not man's very soul can become enslaved.

If, in another dark page of history, Ireland held aloft the torch to guide men out of the darkness of ignorance and barbarianism, should we not welcome her into our circle of freedom and light? We owe much to Ireland. Ireland stands ready to support the ideals we are upholding. The world today needs a nation who keeps faith with God and fellowmen. Ireland is that nation and I want her to be given the opportunity to take her place in the community of nations of the world, as one united people. I hope this rule will prevail.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

#### UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, speaking of self-determination, that is exactly what this resolution calls for. It calls for a plebiscite so that the people of Ireland as a whole can determine what their destiny shall be. As it is now you have the tail wagging the dog. Six Ulster counties are the so-called determinative factor as to Ireland's political future. All Ireland has a population of 4,248,000; 80 percent of that population want Ireland to be one national unity. All Ireland has 32 counties. In this one block of 30 counties, covering an area of over 80 percent of Ireland, they want Ireland to be one national unity. All Ireland elects 199 parliamentary representatives for the two areas in which the country has been divided. Of those, 159, or just under 80 percent, want Ireland to be one national unity. Let all the Irish people determine the question, and not the conservative, hard-boiled, hard-shelled conservatives of this House of Representatives. I want Ireland—Eire and Ulster—to determine what its future shall be.

What actually divides 26 counties of Ireland from the 6 northern counties? There is no natural dividing line; no rivers, mountains, plateaus. It is an arbitrary line—as arbitrary as the line of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. It is an unnatural and an unhealthy division, breeding mischief internally and striking a discordant note internationally.

This resolution, House Resolution 82, is not by any means a resolution of interference. It declares that it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.



I stress particularly the words, "unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary." This is the language which spells out the essence of self-determination, leaving to the people themselves the right to choose for themselves how they shall be governed.

This resolution is the evidence of the interest the people of the United States have always felt for the people of Ireland. The contributions of the Irish to the growth of the United States are a matter of record. The richness, the vitality, the sensitivity, the wit, the poetry of the Irish are fully mixed into our blood stream. Without the Irish, the complexion of our people and our culture would have been a little paler, a little less full-blooded, a little less sensitive. Our interest in the fate of Ireland is a natural one.

The western world has a community of interest—an interest of which Ireland is most inescapably a part. There is little doubt that Ireland would be one of the Atlantic Pact nations were it not for the internal dissension which exists as a result of a divided Ireland. This internal dissension, which played so vital a part in keeping Ireland neutral during the last war, will disappear with unification. When we deplore the division of the world, of country set against country, how much more so must we deplore a country set against itself. Ireland unified would be a further step toward harmony and strength in western civilization.

De Valera and Costello have indicated strongly that Ireland could and would be a most valuable member of the Atlantic Pact nations were it not for the unrest created by partition.

It is little wonder that such unrest lies heavy over the green land of Ireland when we consider how the dominant interests concentrated the industry of Ireland in the six Ulster counties, sacrificing the welfare of the rest of Ireland at the altar of the principle, "Divide and conquer." It is time that these inequalities be dissipated. It is time for Ireland to be one, time for the "house divided" to become whole and indivisible in the interest of Ireland itself and in the interest of the family of nations.

Ireland, with its gift for laughter, buried under the burden of its struggles, must be freed from the heavy hand of brother against brother. The creative spirit of the Irish people cannot find its fullest expression in this climate of division. The Irish fought to free themselves from the yoke of foreign dominance, and, while they succeeded to the admiration of the whole world, it was only a partial victory. Unified Ireland would complete the long, long struggle for independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolution, and I am opposed to the rule which seeks to make it in order. I am opposed to it for a number of reasons. The primary reason is that it is strictly none of our business. I expect in these few minutes to talk more, however, about the rule than about the resolution because as a member of the Committee on Rules, I was present when this silly document was voted out of the Committee on Rules. I might say I was shocked when I saw that the great Committee on Foreign Affairs had reported such a resolution. When it was reported out by the Committee on Rules I was deeply distressed. When that hearing was held before the Rules Committee, and I saw what it was, I looked around to see the chairman of that great committee in whom we all have great confidence. He was not there. I looked around to see the ranking minority member of that committee, in whom we all have great confidence. He was not there. I looked around to see the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVRS] who devotes much time and energy to foreign affairs. He was not there. I inquired about that, and then I looked for the hearings on the bill. I found by looking at the hearings that there had been 15 minutes of hearings, which time was consumed altogether by the author of the bill. No one else had testified. Then, I naturally wondered, as this is a matter of foreign affairs, what was the attitude of the administration. I found there had been no report from the Department of State; there had been no request from the President of the United States. I wondered then, and I wonder now, where this all came from—why did it arise? I found a committee amendment here—a committee amendment which gives this a very serious aspect. The amendment to this resolution says:

Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires the settlement of the unification of Ireland.

Here is a matter which the author says involves the peace and security of the world, and yet the chairman of the committee is not consulted—the ranking minority member of the committee is not consulted; the State Department is not consulted; and the President of the United States is not consulted—what are we thinking about? It says "the peace of the world." Well, what are we going to do if we pass this resolution? Whom are we going to fight? Personally, I do not want to fight anybody. I want to love everybody. I want to get along peacefully with the Northern Irishmen, the Southern Irishmen, and particularly the American Irishmen, and those Irishmen who live and vote in my district. I do not want to fight any of them. It is said the peace and security of the Nation depends on this resolution that comes here without the consent or knowledge of the chairman of the committee and your administration. Now, some of you may want to fight. I do not want to fight, but let me say to those boys who do want to fight, if you want to fight go on out to Korea. There is plenty of

fighting going on out there. A great many of the boys we have sent out there would be very glad to have some volunteers from the House of Representatives to relieve them and let them have a chance to come back home. Those boys of you who want to fight, go on out to Korea and fight, but let us not fight with the Irish.

Of course, there have been a great many injustices in this world. I was thinking about this thing this morning. I said to myself, "I wonder if it would not be a good idea to settle some of these domestic questions." I looked back over the history of my country and I remember a great wrong that was done to my great Commonwealth of Virginia nearly a hundred years ago. This Congress, without asking us anything about it, cut Virginia in two. They took half of it and said, "That is going to be West Virginia and the rest of it is going to be Virginia." They did not ask us anything about it. We did not have any plebiscite to determine that question. We have not had it yet. So I prepared a little amendment which I hope my good friends will support if and when this bill comes up—and I hope it will not come up—because while West Virginians are pretty good folks, I do not want to start any more wars, but if we have to start a war with Ireland, let us start it with West Virginia first. What my amendment provides is that before this shall become effective, in view of the fact that Virginia by this Congress, unlawfully and in violation of the Constitution, was bisected and cut in half, and that has never been corrected in the last hundred years, before you go to fooling with Ireland, give us a plebiscite in Virginia; not West Virginia. They did not have anything to do with it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield. I want to get my good friend from West Virginia back where he belongs in Virginia. I want you to give us a plebiscite in Virginia. I think it is a perfectly good request, if you are going to fool with Ireland. Give us a plebiscite and see if we want to take West Virginia back where it rightfully belongs. If we have that plebiscite there would be a vote to take West Virginia back, with all of its coal mines and riches which we need so badly in Virginia. Now, I think that is just as reasonable, as trying to pass this resolution telling Ireland what to do about her domestic problems.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I decline to yield.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry. I would have to yield to the other gentlemen if I did. I just want to say my little say. I want to urge you all if you are going to do this thing—of course, there might be some other very valid amendments to correct many of the hardships that have taken place over the history of civilization, but let us not just confine it to Ireland. Let us correct all the evils of the world. Somebody has

said that the only reason we were doing this thing—and I do not subscribe to this theory—but some Members have said to me, "Well, we have got our fingers in everybody else's business in the world except Ireland, and therefore we must pass this resolution so as to get into that mess. We are in all of the other messes in the world."

Now that may not be the reason for it, but it looks to me like we have done just that very thing.

Now, getting back to the serious side of this proposition, this resolution ought not to be adopted. We all know that. It has no place on the floor of this House. It should never have come out of the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Rules Committee. It was all right to introduce the resolution, and after the resolution was introduced and the committee did the author of it the courtesy to hear him, then I think the joke had gone far enough.

Let us vote this resolution down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYLE). The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In view of the gentleman's statement, will the Chair advise how this rule got here? How did it get before the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Rules Committee sent it here. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said he did not vote for it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the rule should be granted and an opportunity should be given to debate the merits of this issue.

We have traditionally and on other occasions tried to help people who were seeking unification or were seeking self-government or were seeking a democratic expression of their desire for self-determination as they saw it. That is in the tradition of our country. Why deny this expression of help to the Irish people?

Americans have expressed their sympathy individually and the Government has expressed its sympathy with just such efforts by other peoples. We ourselves in the trying days of the American Revolution were the recipients of the benefit of such help and sympathy. By this resolution all the House is asked to do is to express this sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for so elementary an objective as unification.

By turning down this resolution and not granting the opportunity of debating the merits of this proposal which is entirely consonant with our traditions and the way we have acted on other occasions of this nature, we would be rebuffing a most friendly people who believe very deeply in the justice of Irish

unification and that it ought to be achieved.

Certainly the opportunity for consideration should not be terminated in such cursory way as those who oppose the rule have advocated. I trust that the House will, in all justice, vote this rule.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia, while lacking in reason, were strong in ridicule. Ridicule is frequently used to bolster a weak intellectual position. The gentleman further ridiculed the idea of a plebiscite saying that a plebiscite should be held in Virginia and maybe that State could then recover the territory that is now West Virginia. Let us follow his idea to its ultimate and have a plebiscite in the entire United States and then we might be able to get rid of Virginia.

There have been many statements made today that were historically inaccurate. I do not mean that those who made them did so deliberately, but I do know they could not have known anything of the history of Ireland. For 700 years Ireland had its own parliament. Its representatives did not come from the south. They came from the north, south, east, and west. During that period there was no division of the country. During that period they were a homogeneous people. This partition of Ireland and its separation of the 6 northern counties from the 32 southern counties was brought about less than 25 years ago and came into existence not by virtue of any desire of the Irish people but through the machinations of the foreign hostile English Parliament despite the fact that 80 percent of the Irish people had expressed themselves in favor of separation from England. The English Parliament overruled their will and divided the country hoping to create unrest and discord that some day would cause Ireland to ask England to take over their Government again. This has not happened. Yet, the artificial barrier exists.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] asks whether the President of the United States and the Secretary of State would favor ending this partition. I could not answer for these gentlemen, but the gentleman from Illinois knows and I know that the President and the Secretary of State both oppose the partition of Korea.

Much has been said in this House today about sticking our nose in other nations' business. We passed a resolution calling for the establishment and maintenance of a free republic in Palestine. We were parties to the partition of the Austro-Hungarian empire. We were a party to the taking of Albania from Italy. The great Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, realized that a natural country could not be divided and felt so strongly about it that he brought about the Civil War in our own country.

The Irish people are great lovers of liberty. For 700 years they felt the tyrant's heel. They were a small nation, and they were opposed by a country

more than 10 times larger than their own. But the lamp of liberty was never allowed to go out. In the hills and in the valleys, in the cottages and in the mansions, in the Catholic home, in the Protestant home for centuries these people talked and thought of nothing but the day when Ireland would regain her freedom. They fought unrelenting until the greatly hoped for day became an established fact. But they have never been selfish about this love for liberty. They have extended the hand of help all over the world to any people who felt the despot's heel. They carried the torch of freedom in France, Belgium, Holland, and Spain. They led the revolutions of Central America, South America, and Cuba. Thirty-five percent of Washington's Army were men of Irish blood. They were almost 50 percent of the Army of the North. They furnished Father Ryan, the poet of the Confederates. They gave the South the Irish Brigade that fought so valiantly at Shiloh. They now appeal to this House for moral assistance. They ask that you recognize their love of freedom and their ambition to have a united nation. They appeal to you to wipe out the artificial barrier created by a foreign parliament.

I sincerely hope that this House will realize its obligation and will not turn its back on those who helped this country not only in its infancy, but all through the years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend at this point in the Record the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Irish descent have played an important part in our Nation's history. They have helped shape our civilization and our way of life. An Irishman, Maj. Gen. John Sullivan, fired the first shot in the American Revolution, and we recall with great pride that an Irishman, Colin Kelly, was the first American bombardier to sink a Japanese ship during World War II. Irish-Americans have been at the forefront of those who have risked their lives for this country. Is it not proper, then, that this Nation should concern itself with the injustices which have so long been perpetrated upon the indomitable Irish who seek to end the long domination of their Emerald Isle?

Quite apart from our gratitude to the Irish people, who have so greatly contributed to our position of leadership in the civilized world, we must also be concerned with principles. We must support those who seek justice and equality, those who seek independence within their ancestral domain, and the dignity of self-determination.

Fortunately, the people of the United States are aware of certain injustices in the world. On occasions where our State Department was reluctant to act in a given situation, the people spoke up and through our democratic processes our Government was persuaded to take the necessary action. This is precisely what happened in the historic and suc-



successful struggle of the Jewish people regarding Palestine. The valiant efforts of the Jewish people to attain sovereignty for Israel won the support of the American people, and this country was the first to recognize the Jewish state.

The struggle of the Irish people to determine their own destiny has been going on for over 700 years. The Irish have never willingly submitted to foreign domination, but after the turn of the present century these courageous defenders of liberty were able to overwhelm the vast superiority of the British in their monopoly of power. Following World War I, the Irish were able to secure their independence within the British Commonwealth, which has since matured into complete independence for part of the island. Now they are determined that their long and difficult efforts to achieve unity shall no longer be frustrated. With the aid which we Americans can give them, there are strong hopes that the Irish dream will, indeed, soon come true.

The fallacious argument offered by the adherents of partition is that Northern Ireland has the right of self-determination. This right is important, but it should be applied to the whole of Ireland, which is geographically, economically, and culturally a single unit. There is no doubt that the majority of the Irish people desire the end of partition and their will should not be blocked by the recalcitrance of the British in the northern section.

Surely no better reason for the end of partition could be put forth than the wishes of the people themselves. The Irish economy is lopsided and impaired as long as the industrial north is divorced from the predominantly agricultural south. Surely both areas would profit by the integration of their complementary economies. While the six counties of Ulster are richer and more prosperous than other portions of Ireland, it is plain that they cannot exist alone. They need the south perhaps more than the south needs them.

Then, too, it is not irrelevant to call attention to the very strategic position which Ireland holds in this day of distraught international politics. The Irish are certainly disposed to being anti-Communist. They are tied by a traditional link of friendship to the United States, but they feel that they cannot cooperate with Great Britain in any strategic or political move in time of emergency until the six counties of Ulster are rid of British domination. When this logical and realistic aim is achieved Ireland, which is predisposed to Western union and membership in the Atlantic Pact, will certainly be a most vital factor in our Western defense system. Thus it is to our own advantage to help Ireland in her struggle for unification.

We, in America, can best contribute to this effort by intensifying the very course which we have long followed. We should make it perfectly clear to the British, with whom we are allied in the common struggle against Communist world domination, that we are determined that the small nations of the world shall have their share of freedom. We should encourage the Department of State to warn Great Britain not to

thwart the historical ambition of the Irish people, otherwise we cannot really expect the ideological battle against communism to gain ground in the several oppressed areas of the world. Britain must keep faith with the principles dear to the ideology of the west and relinquish her hold upon a people and land where she has long been unwelcome.

The democratic nations of the west cannot tolerate the existence of any nation, however small, in their midst, which is subject to outside control and domination. The Irish people have the right to sovereignty over all their national territory. The right of the British to carve up the Irish Nation should be repudiated.

In conclusion, I wish to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative FOGARTY, for introducing this deserving resolution, House Resolution 82, which I support wholeheartedly and unqualifiedly. I also take this opportunity to commend my colleagues, Representatives HEFFERNAN, KELLY, KEOGH, O'TOOLE, and ROONEY, for their valiant struggle in support of the Irish people and their splendid work in behalf of this resolution, which I hope will be passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, with the name TIMOTHY PATRICK SHEEHAN, I have a right to speak on this proposition before the House.

First of all, with but 2 minutes I cannot make many observations. I should like to say that the comparison made by a previous Member when he compared Texas to Ireland is like comparing limburger cheese with stale beer and deciding they are comparable because both limburger cheese and stale beer smell.

Texas, as you know, was an independent state and was never a part of the United States until it decided to come in of its own accord, if my knowledge of history is right. Ireland was a contiguous proposition and its area was not broken up until arbitrarily broken up by England. So his comparison does not hold water.

I will agree with anyone that we have no right to interfere in the internal affairs of particular nations. I agree with that wholeheartedly. However, we do have the right to state principles, and as this right should be preserved, we in Congress or any other place should stand up and state principles. The principle here is the matter of uniting a separated country, not keeping it divided.

May I quote from Abraham Lincoln, who, on February 18, 1861, at Indianapolis, had this to say, then compare it directly with the Irish situation today:

On what rightful principle may a State, being not more than one-fiftieth part of the Nation in soil and population, break up the Nation and then coerce a proportionally larger subdivision of itself in the most arbitrary way.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I favor the rule and I agree with my col-

league from Illinois that there is a principle involved in this question, contrary to and notwithstanding the arguments of those who say we are interfering in the internal affairs of another nation.

Did not England interfere with the internal affairs of the United States during the Civil War when she tried to maintain the partition of the North and South with a blockade off the Atlantic coast? Did she not at that time use every means possible to bring about enmity between the North and South and to prevent the North from uniting the United States? Are we not at this moment engaged in a bloody struggle in Korea at the expense of some 85,000 casualties and billions of dollars to settle the question of the partition of North and South Korea? Are we not using our force to demand that North Korea be a part of the whole of Korea, if we can possibly succeed in accomplishing that? Are we not at the present time engaged in a revision of the Italian Treaty that has to do with a question between Yugoslavia and Italy involving the harbor of Trieste? Did not the President of United States this morning send a message to the British Government asking it to do something other than it has done in settling the Iranian oil dispute? He did not ask Congress. We do not have a resolution here to debate on that question. The President took it on his own initiative to do that. And why? Is it because we love England more or fear England more, or that we love Italy and Yugoslavia and Korea more than we do Ireland?

Compare what those countries have done for the United States with what Ireland has done and your score will be very much in favor of Ireland.

Ireland has always been willing to cooperate with the other nations of the world to bring about economic stability, security, and peace. Her willingness to become a member of the United Nations was stopped by a veto of Soviet Russia which is evidence that Russia dislikes Ireland because of its consistent anti-Communist policy.

Ireland's desire to become part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is thwarted on the principle that should she become a member of NATO, she would thereby obligate herself to defend a part of her own country, the six northern counties, which is now occupied by force by Great Britain. Ireland's position with regard to these matters was contained in a statement by Sean McBride, the Irish Minister of External Affairs, in Washington on March 14, 1951, when he said and I quote:

What part is Ireland playing in international affairs? I think that question is best answered by reference to the four international organizations with which we might be directly concerned: the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the OEEC, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

As regards the United Nations the position is that we applied for membership several years ago, being willing to undertake the full responsibilities of such membership. We were, however, kept out by the veto of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—Russia. Ironical as it may sound, Russia says that she cannot regard us as a democratic or peace-loving country.

As regards the Council of Europe and the OEEC, we are members of both these organizations. In both of them our representatives have consistently adopted the progressive policy of favoring developments which tended toward a united Europe. In the OEEC we have favored greater liberalization of trade, and we are in a position to do so since our own trade policies are among the most liberal in Europe. In the Council of Europe we have supported every measure which tended to strengthen the Assembly as against the Committee of Ministers, that is to say, every measure which represented a step on the road to a Parliament of Europe. In fact no nation has been so prompt as we have been to support the uniting of Europe and the free and voluntary merging of individual sovereignties. We are, however, quite as stubbornly nationalistic as the United States would be when it is suggested that we should surrender our rights or a portion of our sovereignty to another nation.

As regards the last organization, that of the Atlantic Pact Powers, our position is this: we were asked to join and we refused. You will want to know why.

I think on this vitally important question I cannot do better than take as my point of departure the cardinal principles of your own foreign policy, as set out in an admirable document, Our Foreign Policy, issued by your State Department.

These are the three points:

We are an independent nation and we want to keep our independence:

We attach the highest importance to individual freedom and we mean to keep our freedom:

We are a peaceful people and we want to get rid of wars and the threat of wars.

We, in Ireland, would subscribe wholeheartedly to every one of these principles but, being historically less fortunate than you, we are forced to state them for ourselves in a somewhat different manner. This is how we have to state them:

We are not an independent nation because a portion of it is still unfree but we want to achieve our independence:

We attach the highest importance to individual freedom but many of our people have not got that freedom:

We are a peaceful people but part of our territory has been taken from us by war and the threat of war.

These points which, as you will surmise, refer to the fact that part of our country, the six northeastern counties, is held under British rule, may seem exaggerated to you. Discrimination, gerrymandering and political police by which the entity known as "Northern Ireland" is set up and maintained, is the cause of such feeling in Ireland that no Irish Government could attempt, without immediately being driven from office, to enter into a military alliance with the power which is responsible for it. It would be as impossible for an Irish Government to accept the article of the Atlantic Pact which binds each participant to respect the territorial integrity of the others as it would have been for Abraham Lincoln to accept Mason and Dixon's line as an international frontier. You do not accept the territorial integrity of a neighbor who is encamped in your garden. We are fully conscious of the gravity of our decision. Indeed in our reply to the invitation to join the Pact we suggested that, in the interests of the greater safety and strength of the chain of Atlantic Defense, the members might discuss ways and means of solving the problem which precluded us from membership. Ireland is willing and anxious to play her full part in international affairs, she is already making a certain contribution, but is prevented from doing her full share by two outside powers: Russia and Britain. I do not say that the policies or actions of these two powers are the same, or even comparable. All I do say is that

they are inclined to look rather alike. Both are powers with imperial traditions and to imperial powers the partitioning of small nations has always seemed expedient and, therefore, just. This was, and is, the policy of Russia in Poland. It has been the policy of Russia in Korea. In both cases the Russians found some Poles and some Koreans to support them, but in both cases the partition of a nation, a disaster in itself, leads to other disasters.

The Fogarty resolution states in part that "the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland," which in effect means that if the partition of Ireland is settled and Ireland is united as one nation, it can then lend its full support to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization thus adding needed strength which does not now exist.

I believe it is to the interest of the United States that this resolution should be adopted, and I therefore favor the adoption of the rule making the Fogarty resolution in order for full debate and consideration by the House.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee reported this resolution by a vote of 11 to 6, I understand. Personally, I cannot see why some of these gentlemen fear any damage from this resolution.

In 1919 I had the privilege of writing a similar resolution, and it was passed without objection. Was anyone injured by it? I might say, too, that I have advocated and supported numerous resolutions that have been brought to the floor of this House expressing interest in, and encouragement to, struggling small nations in their hour of despair, such as Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and several others when they were seeking home rule. I recall that I, with many others in this House, supported the resolution expressing confidence in and wishing success to the new State of Israel when it became established as an independent nation. What harm did any of these previous actions do? Who was hurt? What complaint arose from any of the large nations against these generous gestures we have approved from time to time. I know that not a word of criticism resulted from the enactment of a similar resolution in 1919.

If we believe in doing the right thing by the minorities and the oppressed, I feel we should be courageous enough to pass favorably upon this resolution because it can do no damage and it is bound to do a great deal of good for people who are fighting for freedom, liberty, and self-determination. That is all this resolution asks, and we should all be in favor of such a policy.

Mr. Speaker, I have abhorred and opposed oppression and discrimination since my early youth, for I had occasion to witness at that early age the struggle going on in my homeland for justice and self-determination; for freedom and liberty from the Austro-Hungarian imperialism that maintained a stranglehold on the Czech and Slovak peoples. I always looked forward to the day when

the enlightened peoples of the world would join in bringing about a true spirit of self-determination to minorities and enslaved peoples in the smaller nations so that they might obtain that liberty and freedom of which they have been deprived by ruthless, autocratic, and despotic rulers.

I personally recollect that President Wilson, following World War I, assured the smaller nations of the world the right of self-determination, and we are pursuing that same policy today at great cost in Korea.

While a few of these small nations succeeded in attaining their independence following World War I, unfortunately many of them have since been deprived of their cherished freedom and liberty, such as Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and others.

Therefore, I favor this resolution because it follows the principles advocated and enunciated by our Government. All this resolution does is to express the sense of this House that the Irish people should be given the right, through a plebiscite, to determine their form of government.

There will be some who maintain that we should not tell Great Britain what to do. Well, Great Britain has been telling us what to do for many years, and has, in effect, forced us to do her will, not for our own good but to further her selfish imperialism and to insure the control of her possessions, control over which she secured through military and diplomatic conniving and trickery. Notwithstanding her diplomatic and economic maneuvering, however, some of her so-called possessions have attained independence from the crown, notably India under the leadership of Ghandi, that great disciple of action through peaceful force, while Australia and Canada have been gradually forcing the severance of their ties with their mother country. When it comes to interfering and meddling in the affairs of other nations on the part of Great Britain, we need but recall her imperialistic war in South Africa, 1899 to 1902, when she jumped on little Holland in what is known as the Boer War, and took possession of that vast productive area.

I never did subscribe to the old axiom that might is right, but that unquestionably has been the policy of Great Britain throughout the centuries.

We need but refresh our memories on some of the early history of our own land to see what the policy of Great Britain has been toward small nations and minorities, in recalling her war against our struggling States in 1812, and the aid she gave to the Confederacy in 1861 in the War Between the States.

Mr. Speaker, I recall very vividly the appearance of Mr. Balfour and his coterie in Washington following World War I, when we had come to the rescue of Great Britain in that struggle, pleading that his nation was fighting with its back to the wall and begging for financial aid, and how we again came to her rescue in every way, advancing her over \$8,000,000,000, which even in that day was real money; and how, after a few years, how her financial leaders again came to us asking for a reduction in the



interest rate on these loans, attacking our great country and its leaders as shylocks.

No, Mr. Speaker, we need not go that far back to find that it was Great Britain that was originally and mainly concerned over the expansion of Russia, with her fears of the effect this expansion might have on the private holdings of her lords and regal gentry throughout Asia and the Near East, and her efforts to again unload her woes and problems on us, and how she maneuvered us into supporting her unfavorable position. Once this was accomplished she again brazenly attempted to set herself up as the arbitrator in all world matters, a position which rightfully belonged to us.

Notwithstanding our laudible desires and aims to stop communism, is she not today supporting these same communistic conspiracies, supplying those nations not only with the products of her factories and her industries, but also with the materials of war to be used against our own boys on far-flung battlefields.

Has she not recognized Red China with whom we are now locked in a murderous struggle?

Has she not nationalized her major industry with our money?

Is she not now attempting to bulldoze little Iran which is bravely attempting to protect for her destitute people the sole natural resource asset she has, the vast oil deposits now controlled by a pseudo-government corporation actually owned by her giant oil barons in combination with certain powerful American oil corporations?

I ask you, gentlemen, what justification can there be for any charge that we are interfering with the imperial government of Great Britain in the light of her actions throughout history in interfering with the sovereign rights of small nations? This resolution does not even approach her brazen policies and acts in this regard. It is merely an expression of the sense of this House as to the rights of the Irish people. Why should we not offer this word of encouragement to a great people, who have been dreaming and praying for the opportunity of self-determination in connection with the internal problem of unity; a race which has contributed so greatly to the upbuilding of our own land?

I, for one, firmly believe the Irish people are entitled to, and highly deserving of, this word of encouragement, and I urge the speedy approval of this resolution.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to me to sit here today and listen to some of the arguments made against the adoption of the rule and the adoption of the resolution. It just makes me disgusted.

Some Members forget the history of our country. They have forgotten the fact that since the infant days of our Constitution one of the basic policies of our country has been the right of all nations, large or small, particularly the small ones because they are the ones that need an expression of this policy, to

determine their own future—the right of self-determination.

This House has passed similar resolutions heretofore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] referred to one passed in 1919. This very body and those who spoke against this resolution voted not so long ago to pass a resolution expressing the sense of this body that we believe in "a free and democratic Jewish nation in Palestine" and I fought for that resolution on the principle of self-determination. Yet they take the floor and deny it in this particular case. Why? That is an interesting question. Why?

Those of us who believe in this resolution are simply expressing our opinion that the people of all Ireland should be given the opportunity by a plebiscite, voting, to determine whether or not there should be a united Ireland in its entirety. Certainly geographically it is one unit. Certainly from the angle of population it is one unit. It is self-evident that those two important elements in relation to the self-determination and the unity of a nation, of a people, exist. Yet we have men here, for some reason far beyond my understanding, talking of their love for Ireland but opposing this resolution. I would admire them more if they came out flatly against it and stood on their own ground and took their own responsibility in opposing it, rather than trying to ride two horses at the same time, of opposing this resolution, and at the same time, telling of their high regard or love for those of Irish blood.

As I said, we have passed many resolutions in this body stating the sense of this body. We are not invading or intruding ourselves into the internal affairs of another nation. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] well said, and I agree with him, we are entitled to express our own opinion. We passed a resolution the other day in relation to an American newspaperman who has been tried and convicted and sentenced in one of the satellite Communist nations. Who would dare say that we did not have the right to pass that resolution? We did it. We had the right to pass other resolutions in this body from time to time as they were passed. We have a perfect right to do this.

This is no violation of the comity between nations in the adoption of the resolution, it is an expression of the opinion, if adopted, of the majority of the Members of this Congress. Some try to laugh it off by ridicule.

I am not voting to enter into the internal affairs of another nation by supporting this resolution but I am voting for the time-honored right of all Americans of all generations under constitutional government through their Members of this great body to express their opinion; and that is all we are doing today.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I join with the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in the well-thought-out and eloquently spoken views on the resolution before us. Certainly this rule should be adopted so that free and full debate on the Fogarty resolution may be had.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, love the Irish. I have in my district many great and good friends who are Americans of Irish descent. They and the Maine Yankees get along famously. They, too, are hard working, independent, industrious, and frugal. They, too, are fine citizens. Like the Maine Yankees, they, too, have an infinite capacity for minding their own business.

This resolution is the exact opposite of that splendid trait. We propose to stick our national nose into something which, as a House of Representatives, is none of our darned business. We propose, in the interest of local politics purely, to complicate the international situation and do much to alienate a necessary friend.

If we pass this resolution, we may properly and justly expect the English House of Commons to pass a similar resolution stating that, in the interest of continental defense, the United States should immediately grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. And such a resolution on the part of the English House of Commons would have exactly the same effect on us that this will on them.

If this resolution promoted the cause of Irish unification, it would be a different matter. But this resolution will in no way benefit that cause. It will have the exact opposite effect and will set back that cause for some time. Having lived in England for 2 years during the war, I know their character and reactions fairly well. They resent us as an overgrown child. They are stubborn in their own opinions. The effect of this resolution will be but to freeze them in a determination to retain Northern Ireland in its present status.

As we consider this resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, can we not but conclude that consistency is a jewel that the formulators of our foreign policy have never coveted. We are here deeply concerned with a people in Northern Ireland who now have a form of free, representative government. We do not, however, propose that they who are directly concerned be allowed by a plebiscite to determine their own future. It is to be the people of all Ireland. At the same time that we are so concerned, we are openly supporting with men and materials British colonialism in Malaya and Hong Kong and French colonialism in Indochina and British exploitation of the oil resources of Iran. Is the presence of natural resources to determine whether we are for or against freedom and self-determination of a people? If so, let us make up our minds, say what we mean, and proceed accordingly. No wonder the world wonders where America stands.

In all fact and truth, the passage of this resolution will hurt the cause of Irish unification. The only beneficial effect it might have is on the votes of those Americans of Irish descent who may not realize that it does hurt and not help.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the course of this most interesting debate, I think we are losing sight of, and have lost sight of the question which is before the House. The question before the House does not deal with whether or not we think the people of Ireland should have unity. The question before the House, and the question upon which we shall vote very shortly, is whether or not the House of Representatives will approve the idea of taking up a resolution which has to do with some of the internal affairs of Ireland. I direct my comments in these 3 minutes only to the question of whether or not it is the proper thing for the House of Representatives of the United States Congress to take up the pending bill, debate it and amend it, and then vote on a question which concerns an internal problem in Ireland, a country which has never in its life attempted to interfere with our affairs.

The rule, as it is worded, certainly does not express what it is that we are voting upon, because the rule says:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 82) to provide for the unity of Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, if this resolution could provide for the unity of Ireland, I do not think there is anyone here who would vote against it. The truth is, however, that this House of Representatives cannot do one solitary thing regarding the unity of Ireland.

It is a mistake to bring this resolution to the floor. It is a mistake for us to take legislative action which has no force or effect other than to express an opinion which is not too clearly stated in the resolution anyhow. I think when we say it is the sense of the House of Representatives in this resolution, I would rather say, "It is the nonsense of this House of Representatives" to say there should be unity of Ireland, and then say there should be unity unless there is a vote of a majority of the people of Ireland to the contrary.

Let us consider 1 minute how foolishly we propose to reverse the fairly reasonable situation that exists in Ireland today. By the constitution of the Government of Ireland at the present time, a constitution which is still in effect and which was adopted years ago, all of Ireland and all of the islands adjacent thereto and the territorial waters are included, and that constitution is still in effect. The people of the six counties of Northern Ireland any time they wish can certainly join up with the South, if they want to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, January 3, 1951, was a great and proud day in my lifetime. On that day the distinguished Speaker of this House administered the oath of office to me and others who had been elected to this Eighty-second Congress. It was a proud day because the

people of the Sixteenth District of Ohio had honored me with election to the greatest legislative body in the world.

But, Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat confused when I read House Resolution 82, which is the subject of the rule we are now debating. I thought perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you had left out a few lines of the oath of office which you had administered to me, for I could remember nothing in that oath which had to do with my loyalty to the Constitution of Ireland or the Crown of Great Britain. I reread our oath here in the House, and you were right, Mr. Speaker. You may find it as a part of section 229 of Jefferson's Manual on Rules and Practices of the House of Representatives.

I did not know how right I was when I thought that the people of my district had elected me to the greatest legislative body in the world. I never thought, Mr. Speaker, that some of my duties would be enacting laws or passing resolutions for the administration or conduct of the affairs of Ireland or Great Britain.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has made reference to our strict adherence to the Monroe Doctrine. I should like, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to quote from that document which established the Monroe Doctrine:

Our policy, in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers.

The distinguished majority leader has made his usual eloquent plea for the adoption of this rule and although I do not remember his exact words, he has charged us with having no good reason why this rule should not be adopted. He refers to the early days in the history of this Nation and to the Constitution with his usual vigor, and I may say, Mr. Speaker, with his usual lack of any definite or concrete reference to that Constitution. I say to the distinguished majority leader that if he had but taken the time to study the Constitution, I am sure that he would reach the same conclusion that I have reached, that the House has no constitutional right to adopt this resolution. I do not know what precedent he might seek to follow—my guide is the Constitution.

I remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that he need but read the preamble of that great document, and I am sure that he has many times, and he will find that we have ordained and established the Constitution for ourselves and our posterity. I do not find the word Ireland contained therein.

And I further remind the House that this House exists because it was created by the Constitution, and we must derive our powers and rights from that same Constitution. Most of these powers and rights are established in section 8 of article I, which provides the powers of Congress and the authority of this body:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the . . . powers.

It seems utterly ridiculous that the Congress in these crucial days, with so much to be done for our own people, should be constantly meddling in affairs

which are not of its concern and over which it has no jurisdiction or power. If the majority party who controls the flow of legislation upon this floor is finding it difficult to find issues upon which legislation should be enacted, I refer them to the 1948 platform of the Democratic Party adopted by the Democratic National Convention, July 14, 1948, in Philadelphia, Pa.

In that document they pointed out many, many issues which they promised the American people they would correct. They made promises which they said they would fulfill, and I do not find in the Democratic platform any pledge that they would pass a resolution for Ireland—but there are many broken promises.

Let me refer, Mr. Speaker, to several of the statements contained in the platform of that party.

One of these is:

The Republican Eightieth Congress is directly responsible for the existing and ever-increasing high cost of living. It cannot dodge that responsibility. Unless the Republican candidates are defeated in the approaching elections, their mistaken policies will impose greater hardships and suffering on large numbers of the American people. Adequate food, clothing, and shelter—the bare necessities of life—are becoming too expensive for the average wage earner, and the prospects are more frightening each day. The Republican Eightieth Congress has lacked the courage to face this vital problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the people of this country, in view of this promise and statement, secure any newspaper printed on July 14, 1948, and compare the prices being charged the American people on that date with the prices today and see whether or not the pledges to which I have referred have been kept.

I find one other statement in that platform:

We shall curb the Republican inflation.

I should only like to say in passing that if the Republican inflation was curbed, then the Democratic inflation which has come on since the adoption of that platform has brought this Nation to the brink of economic collapse.

Why are we not doing something about that rather than debating the passage of legislation for Ireland?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, just one or two items which that Democratic platform said:

We pledge the continued maintenance of those sound fiscal policies which under Democratic leadership have brought about a balanced budget and reduction of the public debt by \$28,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, with a national debt today of approximately \$260,000,000,000, with a budget completely out of balance, and a constantly mounting public debt, should we not be trying to put our house in order rather than acting as a back-fence spinster trying to tell the mother of a large family how to raise her children?

Just one more interesting comment from the platform of broken promises:

We favor the reduction of taxes whenever it is possible to do so without unbalancing the Nation's economy.



I will say to the distinguished majority leader that his party and mine have pledged statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. Where are those statehood bills and why has not the leadership of this House given this Congress an opportunity to carry out the will of the people of this Nation which is so well-known to all of us?

Why must we pass a resolution that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland when worthy subjects of the United States are denied the status of statehood?

I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, what would happen to the blood pressure of most of the Members of this House if we would receive from Great Britain a resolution directing us to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. I am sure that most of the statements that would be made by the membership of this House would, under the rules of the House, be expunged from the RECORD because they would be unprintable.

I should like to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that the passage of this resolution would be adding grist to the propaganda mill in Moscow. It could well be said that their charges against us are becoming true, that is, that we desire to control and dictate to all the governments of the world.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will join me in voting against this rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when this resolution was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I opposed bringing it out. I do not think this rule to make it in order ought to be adopted. I do not think passage of it, or extended debate on it, will do anybody any good, and it can do everybody concerned real harm.

It so happens that my branch of the Irish family comes from the south of Ireland, and my wife's branch comes from the north of Ireland. By much patient and persistent persuasion, I got her to join up with my branch from the south on a voluntary basis. That is the way we solved the problem of partition. Mr. Speaker, that is the only way the partition of Ireland or any such problem can be solved, in my judgment—by the voluntary desire and choice of both parties.

Some of you will remember that for several years I have annually sponsored an amendment to the various foreign-aid bills, which amendment declared it to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the economic unification and political federation of Europe. I thought we had a right, even a duty, to express that view and I was happy that this year the committee and the House and the Senate all adopted the amendment.

I think it would be proper for us to pass a resolution saying that the Congress would look with favor upon a union of the two parts of Ireland, if both sides want it. But that is not what the resolution before us says. It says "it is the sense of this House that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear major-

ity of all of the people of Ireland in a free plebiscite determine and declare to the contrary." That puts the people of 26 counties against those of 6 counties. Such a plebiscite would, of course, be loaded in favor of union regardless of the wishes of a majority of those in the 6 northern counties.

Mr. Speaker, few people can be more aware than the Irish of the difficulties a minority undergoes when it is held in a union against its will. No people ever fought harder and more resolutely than the Irish to get their full independence. I sympathized with them in that struggle, and so did all Americans. For the very same reason that I sympathized with and supported the southern Irish as a minority in their struggle for self-determination, I must sympathize with and support the northern Irish as a minority, if they want to be independent or separate. I have no certain knowledge as to their wishes. But they ought not to be brought into any union unless they themselves so indicate by a free plebiscite in their own six counties.

Now if the resolution said that "it is the sense of this House that we favor the unification of Ireland, if a clear majority of all of the voters in each of the two sections of Ireland, in a free plebiscite so determine," I think that we would be within the reasonable bounds of our jurisdiction. We have a right to say that we believe it would be good for the world if both sides want to get together. I think it would be wonderful if they were voluntarily to arrange such a wedding. I am in favor of voluntary weddings. I am not in favor of shotgun marriages, and that is precisely what this resolution would accomplish. I hope the rule will be voted down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has expired.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened during the past 55 minutes to those who are opposed to this rule. Those who are opposed to the rule no doubt are opposed to the resolution. There is no question about that. To those who have spoken against the rule let me say this—I have yet to find one good concrete reason why this rule should not be adopted. You have been beating all around the bush. You have spoken in vague generalities. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee said adoption of the resolution would do harm. What harm will it do? I want all of you who have opposed this rule to show me where its adoption would be harmful. Not one of you has cited any specific instance of harm which will result from the adoption of this rule. As the majority leader said on the floor a moment ago, you are attempting to talk this resolution to death. Lacking any positive argument against the principle involved you would ridicule it into defeat. That is all you are doing. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said there were no hearings on this resolution at all; that only the author of the resolution was heard for 15 minutes. Here are the hearings that

were held—163 pages of them, in April, 1950, at a public hearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee. That is the answer to you, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, when you say there were no hearings at all. I do not know who was invited to testify, in opposition or otherwise, but it was public knowledge at that time, properly announced, that those hearings were to be public. Not one individual in the country, from the House or the Senate or the administration. No one opposed to this procedure, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee in opposition to this resolution. And this is the same resolution which I have introduced during each session of Congress for the past 3 years.

Some have said that the Irish people have not even consented to join the Atlantic Pact. Of course they could not consent to join the Atlantic Pact, as long as that partition exists in the northeastern section of Ireland. How could a sovereign nation join in a compact with an aggressor—still occupying, in fact, a substantial portion of its homeland—and agree to defend—defend what?—continuing aggression and occupation; continuing refusal to deny the voice of the vast majority of the people of that oppressed land. We speak here as great Americans, great Americans who believe in freedom and democracy and the right of all people to determine their form of government. You know as well as I do that all the people of Ireland were given a promise by Great Britain in 1914 and 1915, when they entered the First World War, that they could have an election, an election to determine the shape and form of their nation and its government. An election was held in 1918 under British rule when all the officials of the Republic of Ireland were in jail. Yet for the first time in the history of the world, with all the opposition the Crown could array against them, the people in Ireland, 80 percent of them, voted for freedom and unity and a new nation under God. Now you get up here and talk about Americanism and the right to free speech and freedom of assembly and the right of self-determination. You are going to condone just what Great Britain did to the Irish back in 1918 if you refuse to consider honestly this resolution. You are condoning their police-state methods that exist today in the six-county area of Northern Ireland. You are condoning the methods there today that we as Americans are decrying, day in and day out, all over the world, because we are against Stalin and communism. If you saw these police-state methods in action you would not recognize British rule. You would say that was rule under the Kremlin and under Stalin, because there is no difference.

The previous speaker said the majority of those six counties did not want to be united with the Republic. That is not the true fact. Four and one-half counties out of the six today, if they had a chance to vote—and that is all I am asking—if they had a chance to vote today, four and one-half counties of the six would vote for genuine, honest, and honorable freedom, as they did back in 1918. All I ask is that Great Britain

keep its promise made in 1918, when 80 percent of the people voted for freedom with honor and justice. By doing that, if Great Britain will permit the elimination of that unnatural partition across Ireland, Ireland will come into the Atlantic Pact. If we ever get rid of the veto power that Russia wields in the United Nations, Ireland will be a member of the United Nations. It has been Russia who has kept her out by the use of the veto. Ireland is the most anticommunistic country that exists in the world today, and can there be a man or woman in this House to declare to the contrary. That is why she is not in the United Nations.

As far as weakening our strength in the world today, there is no question in my mind that resistance against communism would be strengthened all over the world if that outpost in the Atlantic Ocean, as God intended it to be, were a free and sovereign nation aligned with the cause of freedom. As far as men of Irish descent are concerned, I came across this book just a little while ago put out by the Navy Department. Take a look at it, look in the back of that book at the Medals of Honor that have been given and see the great number of Irish names in the list. There is the record; look at it.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am for the passage of this resolution. I take exception to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who, among other points raised the challenge that if Members of this House want to fight let them go to Korea and not stir up friction at home by voting for this measure. As one who did just that, who went to Korea to uphold the principle, I trust, that freedom is indivisible, I am compelled to reject the gentleman's position, a facetious one to say the least.

And to the remarks of the distinguished and courageous gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] whose high honor it is to direct the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I must demur. No one desires to imperil the harmony of the free world, especially against the common danger of Communist Russia, at this or any other time. Passage of the resolution jeopardizes nothing but a wrong.

Much is said of the reaction of the British Parliament; that it would have the right to tell us to mind our own business; that we would be meddling in the affairs of friendly nations in passing this resolution. This is to say that our friends are never wrong only our enemies. Surely such is an argument based on expediency, not justice. In her thousand long year history, has England ever hesitated to do something because of the reaction of other parliaments? Did England hesitate to give Japan the green light when it crossed the Yalu in 1931, especially when Secretary of State Stimson invoked the Pact of Paris calling upon the nine signatories to halt Japan's aggression? Did England hesitate to give Hitler the green light in 1933 when it hesitated to spearhead a drive to guarantee the eastern Locarno, thereby signaling Hitler to go east? Did Hore-Belisha

check Mussolini's drive into Ethiopia? Was England mindful of other parliaments when it recognized Red China, worse still when its Foreign Office stopped supporting Chiang Kai-shek fully 4 years before it advised us it had done so? And if England was not backing Chiang, while we were for 4 years, who was she backing? Was Winston Churchill mindful of allied opinion when he told Mikolajczyk, of Poland, to relinquish to the Soviets the eastern slice of Poland, in spite of fervent protestations by General Anders, hero of Monte Cassino, that Mikolajczyk had no constitutional right to do so? Was England mindful of the reaction of other parliaments when she announced she would continue to trade with the Soviets because she said she needed Russia's grain and timber? Was England mindful of other parliaments when she insisted we stay south of the thirty-eighth parallel?

Mr. Speaker, is not the need for justice equally as compelling as the need for grain and timber? Was not the lesson we learned in World War II a recognition of the need for watching one's friends as well as one's enemies? And had the true facts about the slaughter in Katyn Forest been revealed when they were learned, in 1942, might we not have been more cautious with Russia? Truth, Mr. Speaker, truth firms up the will to resist and fight back against wrong, does it not?

This House has recently voted the largest military appropriations in its history. The free world is girding for strength to enforce its will, its agreements. Its will for what? Peace with freedom and justice. That is what our Secretary of State says in today's papers, does he not? Peace, with freedom and justice for friend and foe. Freedom and justice are indivisible. They apply at all times, not merely when it is convenient to chant the cry.

When our boys were smashing their way from Inchon to Seoul, did the judge advocate of the Tenth Army Corps hesitate to enforce courts-martial proceedings against soldiers guilty of breaches of military discipline?

Mr. Speaker, our traditions count for ourselves and the world. We are girding for strength—we are closing the gap between our bayonet point and our covenants so that the latter can be enforced. Do we dare to think we can inspire those under the heel of Soviet tyranny to have hope in freedom's cause when we in this House refuse to pass a rule to discuss one of freedom's problems—the unification of Ireland?

When this resolution comes to the floor of the House again next year, I trust those of Irish forebears will allow time for debate to those with forebears from other lands who know with equal experience how tyranny rots the bones. I regret I was not allowed time on the floor. I asked the chairman guiding this resolution for time; he had none to give. I asked the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], to yield to me on two occasions during his debate—and as his time was limited, I understand his refusal to yield. Accordingly, I state the above for the Record. I hope

that truth and justice will yet prevail, and that debate for the unification of Ireland will be allowed on the floor of this House.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Irish are cognizant of the unity amid diversity of the United States and look for spiritual help from us to bring to their nation unity out of its diversity. They want their country to be what we proclaim America to be when we recite the pledge of allegiance to our flag—"One nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

In a world in which the dominant ideological color is not black or white but gray, there is nothing either indefinite or indefinable in Ireland's tragic story. The creative power of God brought it into being out of nothingness.

From sea to sea—from the Bay of Belfast to the Cove of Cork—it is by nature one undivided entity. That oneness was sundered by the partition of 1920, which cut off its most strategic segment, Ulster, where the intense struggle for freedom began. Ulster was Ireland's Lexington and Concord, and this is the portion that is separated from independent Ireland by a line of demarcation that is an indictment of the natural law of boundaries, logic, and diplomacy. The arbitrary partition of Ireland was the error of men.

One nation under God was the prayer of Lincoln, and that prayer was answered after a hundred blood-drenched battlefields. A Mason and Dixon line dividing our country today would present a parallel to Ireland as it is now partitioned. *E Pluribus Unum*, the mighty symbol of the United States of America, would be a folly and a myth had the Union not survived. President Lincoln said that by all means, the Union must be preserved. Every nation today seeks its own unity. India, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines, to mention a few, have sought and found their own freedom within recent years. Present-day Germany, divided into French, Russian, British, and American zones, seeks to regain its unity as a nation.

The morally indefensible partition of Ireland ought to evoke a protest not alone from a sympathetic world, but from an understanding world. To retain the partition of Ireland is foolhardy when she alone, in proximity to quaking Europe, is untouched by communism.

Divide and rule were the military tactics of the Caesars and in their wake lay strewn the remnants of once mighty powers and world empires.

Lovers of liberty and righteousness cannot afford to permit Ireland to be the latest victim of divide and conquer. A united Ireland would be an impregnable fortress against the onslaughts of communism with all its insidious works and deceitful ploys. Ireland stands as a flaming torch of freedom in a world threatened with communism. If given its unity and freedom of action, Ireland will throw its beam of faith and determination over land and sea to enlighten this spiritually darkened world, sorely in need of guidance.

One Member has criticized Ireland because it has not accepted membership in the Atlantic Pact. There are certain



facts which should be known. Since the British Government holds that part of northeastern Ireland claiming it as British territory, the Irish Government says that to join the Atlantic Pact would mean that it was ratifying this forcible partition of Ireland, which it has never recognized. The pact pledges each member to guarantee the "territorial integrity" of all the others. And since Britain claims northeastern Ireland as British territory the Irish Government would be put in the position of guaranteeing what it has always regarded as an unjust usurpation of Irish territory.

Of course, the reference by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] regarding the division between Virginia and West Virginia was meant to be facetious. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] fails to recognize the fact that the partition of Ireland is much more than a mere boundary dispute. If the United States had a boundary dispute with Canada, one might say that it was mainly a question of territory. On whichever side of the disputed boundary a man lived, he would find himself under a fair and democratic government. Likewise those citizens of Virginia and West Virginia find themselves under a fair and democratic government. In 1921, the British set up a northern government to govern the territory they claim in Ireland. Shortly after coming into existence, the Northern government declared a state of emergency and passed a special powers act, suspending all the civil guarantees.

The emergency has now lasted nearly 30 years. Let me quote you a couple of opinions from fairly unbiased sources on the northern government. In 1935 the British National Council for Civil Liberties—which included people like Lady Astor and the late Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells—had an investigation made of the northern government. It reported:

Through the use of the special powers, individual liberty is no longer protected by law, but is at the arbitrary disposition of the executive. This abrogation of law has been so practiced as to bring the freedoms of the subject into contempt.

Writing in the New York liberal weekly, the Nation, in August 1949, a former correspondent of the London Daily Herald, Griffin Barry, described the operation of the special powers:

A person detained under these regulations is deprived of protections that have hedged the liberty of the subject in Britain for ages. He may be held indefinitely without being charged and without trial. He is allowed no visitors and no messages. He has no access to legal advice. A curious statute deals with the examination of witnesses by a resident magistrate. . . . A witness may not be accompanied to court by a legal advisor or friend and is specifically not excused from answering questions on the grounds that "an answer may incriminate or tend to incriminate himself." A refusal to answer is punishable by penal servitude up to 14 years.

The objection may be raised that in view of the great threat of communism, the Irish should waive their quarrel with England over the northern territory. To be logical one should also urge the British Government to abolish, or at least to reform, the northern government. But

the British will not even discuss the northern government. One can understand that: The northern government simply cannot stand discussion. It would seem only reasonable to urge the British to be just before urging the Irish to be generous. For the ultimate redress of this injustice, Ireland looks not to arms, for it is a nation dedicated to peaceful settlement of international questions, but to the pressure of enlightened world opinion, especially of American opinion.

One of the previous speakers who opposed the form of this resolution, advocates a voluntary unification of Ireland. Following that logic, one must necessarily condemn the involuntary partition of Ireland which was effected by the British Parliament in 1920 when they arbitrarily divided Ireland. There is no logic in the contention that the passage of time has justified the arbitrary partition of Ireland. Therefore, if one contends that Ireland should have an opportunity to vote to decide whether it shall again become unified, the vote should be taken by all of Ireland, irrespective of the artificial partition forced upon Ireland by the act of the British Parliament.

The approval of this resolution will reflect the sentiments of the American people, whose aim is to bring and to preserve liberty and justice to all peoples everywhere. I urge adoption of the rule for House Resolution 82.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired, all time on the resolution has expired.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. ROONEY asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 139, nays 206, answered "present" 2, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

YEAS—139

Addonizio	Fulton	Larcade
Angel	Furcolo	Latham
Bakewell	Garmatz	Lesinski
Barrett	Gavin	Lyle
Bates, Ky.	George	McCarthy
Bates, Mass.	Gordon	McCormack
Beall	Granahan	McDonough
Beckworth	Green	McGrath
Blatnik	Gwinn	McGregor
Brehm	Hall	McGuire
Buchanan	Edwin Arthur	McVey
Byrne, N. Y.	Hart	Machrowicz
Canfield	Havener	Mack, Ill.
Cannon	Hays, Ohio	Mack, Wash.
Carnahan	Hedrick	Madden
Celler	Heffernan	Mansfield
Chudoff	Herter	Martin, Mass.
Clemente	Heseltun	Marrow
Cunningham	Hillings	Miller, N. Y.
Curtis, Nebr.	Hoffman, Ill.	Mills
Dawson	Holmes	Mitchell
Delaney	Jackson, Wash.	Morano
Dempsey	Javits	Morgan
Dingell	Jenison	Multer
Dollinger	Jonas	O'Brien, Ill.
Dolliver	Karsten, Mo.	O'Brien, Mich.
Donohue	Kearns	O'Hara
Donovan	Keating	O'Neill
Doyle	Kelly, N. Y.	Ostertag
Fallon	Kennedy	O'Toole
Feighan	Kilday	Polk
Fenton	Kirwan	Poulson
Fine	Klein	Price
Flood	Kluczynski	Quinn
Fogarty	Lane	Radwan
Forand	Langham	Rhodes

Ribicoff	Shelley	Watts
Riehlman	Sheppard	Weichel
Rodino	Sieminski	Welch
Rogers, Colo.	Simpson, Ill.	Wharton
Rogers, Mass.	Spence	Wickersham
Rooney	Springer	Wigglesworth
Roosevelt	Sutton	Withrow
Sabath	Tollefson	Yates
Sasser	Trimble	Yorty
Seely-Brown	Vail	Zablocki
Sheehan	Van Zandt	

NAYS—206

Aandahl	Doughton	Miller, Nebr.
Abbitt	Durham	Morris
Abernethy	Eaton	Murray, Tenn.
Adair	Elliott	Nelson
Albert	Ellsworth	Nicholson
Allen, Calif.	Evins	Norblad
Allen, Ill.	Fernandez	Norrell
Andersen, H. Carl	Fisher	O'Konski
Anderson, Calif.	Ford	Passman
Andresen, August H.	Forrester	Patman
Andrews	Frazier	Patten
Arends	Fugate	Perkins
Armstrong	Gamble	Pickett
Aspinall	Gary	Poage
Auchincloss	Gathings	Preston
Ayres	Golden	Prouty
Barden	Goodwin	Rains
Baring	Gore	Ramsay
Battle	Graham	Rankin
Beamer	Grant	Reams
Belcher	Greenwood	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Gross	Reed, N. Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Hagen	Rees, Kans.
Berry	Hale	Richards
Betts	Leonard W.	Riley
Bishop	Halleck	Roberts
Blackney	Hand	Robeson
Bonner	Harden	Rogers, Fla.
Bosone	Hardy	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Harris	Saylor
Boykin	Harrison, Va.	Schwabe
Bramblett	Harrison, Wyo.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Bray	Harvey	Scrivner
Brooks	Hays, Ark.	Sculder
Brown, Ga.	Hill	Secrest
Brownson	Hoeven	Shafer
Bryson	Hoffman, Mich.	Sikes
Budge	Hope	Sittler
Buffett	Horan	Smith, Kans.
Burdick	Hull	Smith, Miss.
Burleson	Hunter	Smith, Va.
Burnside	Ikard	Smith, Wis.
Burton	Jarman	Stanley
Bush	Jenkins	Steed
Butler	Jensen	Stefan
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson	Stigler
Camp	Jones, A'a.	Taber
Carlyle	Jones, Mo.	Tackett
Chelf	Jones	Talle
Chenoweth	Hamilton C.	Thompson,
Chiperfield	Jones, Mich.	Thompson, Tex.
Church	Woodrow W.	Thompson, Tex.
Clevenger	Judd	Van Pelt
Cole, Kans.	Kean	Velde
Colmer	Kearney	Vorys
Combs	Kee	Vursell
Cooper	Kilburn	Walter
Cotton	Lantaff	Werdel
Crawford	LeCompte	Wheeler
Crumpacker	Lind	Whitaker
Curtis, Mo.	Lovre	Whitten
Dague	McConnell	Widnall
Davis, Ga.	McKinnon	Williams, Miss.
Davis, Wis.	McMillan	Williams, N. Y.
DeGraffenried	McMullen	Wilson, Ind.
Denton	Magee	Wilson, Tex.
Devereux	Mahon	Winstead
Dondero	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Dorn	Meador	Wood, Idaho
	Miller, Md.	Woodruff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Bolton Cox  
NOT VOTING—83

Allen, La.	Cooley	Hess
Anfuso	Corbett	Hinshaw
Bailey	Coudert	Hollfield
Baker	Crosser	Howell
Bender	Davis, Tenn.	Irving
Bentsen	Deane	Jackson, Calif.
Boggs, Del.	Denny	James
Boggs, La.	D'Ewart	Kelley, Pa.
Bolling	Eberhart	Keogh
Breen	Elston	Kerr
Brown, Ohio	Engle	Kersten, Wis.
Buckley	Granger	King
Busbey	Gregory	Lucas
Case	Hébert	McCulloch
Chatham	Heller	Marshall
Cole, N. Y.	Herlong	Mason

Miller, Calif.	Powell	Staggers
Morrison	Priest	Stockman
Morton	Rabaut	Taylor
Moulder	Redden	Teague
Mumma	Reece, Tenn.	Thomas
Murdock	Regan	Thornberry
Murphy	Rivers	Vinson
Murray, Wis.	Sadiak	Wier
Patterson	St. George	Willis
Philbin	Scott, Hardie	Wolverton
Phillips	Short	Wood, Ga.
Potter	Simpson, Pa.	

So the resolution was not agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bender for, with Mr. Teague against.  
Mrs. St. George for, with Mrs. Bolton against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia, against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Wolverton.  
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Taylor.  
Mr. Murphy with Mr. James.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Baker.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Case.  
Mr. Heller with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Engle with Mr. Potter.  
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Short.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Elston.  
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Coudert.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Cole of New York.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Mason.  
Mr. Redden with Mr. Patterson.  
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.  
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Denny.  
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hess.  
Mr. King with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Sadiak.  
Mr. Priest with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Phillips.  
Mr. Granger with Mr. Busbey.  
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Corbett.  
Mr. Deane with Mr. Morton.  
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.  
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Stockman.  
Mr. Moulder with Mr. D'Ewart.  
Mr. Howell with Mr. Mumma.  
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Hardie Scott.  
Mr. Irving with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.  
Mr. Wier with Mr. Hinshaw.  
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. St. George. If she were present, she would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CARNAHAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

#### ESTATE OF OVILA P. GAUCHER

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 249) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to the estate of Ovila P. Gaucher, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months'

salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Ovila Gaucher.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 410) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by House Resolution 390, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Select Committee for the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$20,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 403) with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$250,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise engaged.

That the funds granted shall remain available for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities until January 3, 1953.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the sum "\$250,000" and insert "\$100,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION AND STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 158

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 415) with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 158, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Works, not to exceed \$25,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, before the word "expenses" insert "further."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXPENSES OF STUDY AND INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 33

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 417) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the solution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 33 of the Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the problems of small business, not to exceed \$35,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such study and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES FOR STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 433) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by House Resolution 78, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$150,000 in addition to the amount heretofore authorized by House Resolution 153, Eighty-second Congress, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



## ELECTRIC OFFICE EQUIPMENT FOR MEMBERS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 318) with amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the request of any Member, officer, or committee of the House of Representatives and with the approval of the Committee on House Administration, the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to purchase electric office equipment for the use of such Member, officer, or committee. The cost of such equipment shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The Committee on House Administration shall prescribe such standards and regulations (including regulations establishing the types and maximum amount of electric office equipment which may be furnished to any Member, officer, or committee) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

SEC. 3. Electric office equipment furnished under this resolution shall be registered in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and shall remain the property of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the term "Member" includes the Representatives in Congress, the Delegates from the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 1, following the word "That" insert "(a)."

Line 5, following the word "electric" insert the words "or mechanical."

Line 9, strike out line 9 and the remainder of the resolution.

Insert therefor the following:

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), the cost of electric or mechanical office equipment purchased for use in the office of a Member shall not exceed \$1,500 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

"(c) Any Member desiring electric or mechanical office equipment for use in his office in addition to the equipment purchased within the cost limitation prescribed by subsection (b) may request the Clerk of the House of Representatives to purchase such additional equipment at a cost of not to exceed \$1,000. The cost of such additional electric or mechanical office equipment shall be deducted from the gross funds allocated to such Member for clerk hire.

"(d) Electric or mechanical office equipment furnished under this section shall be registered in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and shall remain the property of the House of Representatives.

"(e) As used in this section the term "Member" includes a Representative in Congress, a Delegate from a Territory, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is this a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold that this is a privileged resolution because the expenditure is out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. LECOMPTE. A further parliamentary inquiry, does the gentleman from Virginia control the time?

The SPEAKER. He does.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this resolution, notwithstanding the fact that it has been amended in some respects. As I figure it by a hurried computation, I think this resolution could cost the taxpayers a million dollars or more.

The resolution provides for electric or mechanical equipment for each office at a cost of \$1,500 to be charged to the contingent fund. If each Member asks for such equipment, and probably equipment for several committees—and it includes in addition \$1,000 worth more of equipment to be paid for out of the allowance for clerk hire of each Member—that would be \$2,500 worth of equipment that is provided for in this simple resolution for 435 Members and for the Delegates from Puerto Rico and Alaska and Hawaii, and perhaps for several committees. This will total over a million dollars.

I think that with the budget going up somewhere from \$75,000,000 to \$100,000,000; with the Congress laboring over a bill to raise more taxes, and the budget still far from balanced, that it would be a good time for Members of Congress to practice a little economy themselves. I realize that there may be some Members of Congress who have more correspondence than others, but we have gotten along with the arrangements we have, and I am unalterably opposed at this time to asking the taxpayers to take over the burden of paying for electric or mechanical equipment for 435 offices in addition to several more offices that may be included. I think the Congress can function and get through the present session without this additional equipment. I am unalterably opposed to the resolution. If the Members will ask themselves a question and do a little searching of their conscience they will find out that they can manage without this additional expenditure. If we could have the consideration of this resolution postponed for some time, and if the Members will investigate the sentiment at home, I think they will find there are a considerable number of folks who are not in favor of additional expenditures for Congress at this time.

I am opposed to this resolution, now or later, but at least let us postpone consideration until we can more carefully consider it. This is the best time I have ever seen for Congress to economize on needless expenditures.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Iowa give a rough computation with reference to the cost of this equipment. Does the chairman of the committee have some figures on the cost of this equipment and what the final figure will be?

Mr. STANLEY. If every Member bought all of the equipment he could it would be \$1,080,000.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does that include the amount that will be taken out of the contingency fund, plus the amount that would be taken from the Members' clerk allowance?

Mr. STANLEY. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think the House is making a mistake in acting on this resolution today calling for this expenditure of money. We should study the resolution and what the effects of it will be. Copies of the resolution and the proposed amendment are not available to the membership. I know most of us, when we see someone else get something, say that we want it too, regardless of whether we need it or not.

There are probably a lot of offices around here that need this electrical equipment and I would not want to keep anyone who needs it from having it. There are many of us who do not need this equipment and I think it might be better for the committee to study the possibility of accomplishing some economy by providing a central office for turning out mimeographed letters or any other means of duplication or reproduction that you might prefer. I think upon reflection this House would find it could accomplish the end without expending all of this money, and at a time when this equipment is in short supply, as I understand it, and at a time when we are trying to economize.

I do not like to be contentious about these things, but I do feel that this should be submitted to a vote and, personally, if the chairman does not want to carry this resolution over I am going to be constrained to ask for a roll call vote on the resolution.

Relatively speaking, \$1,000,000 is not a large appropriation. But personally, I do not like to see any amount of money wasted by this House. I know from experience, and from talking with other Members, that some of us have purchased with our own funds some of the equipment authorized by this resolution, only to find that we are not getting the maximum amount of use out of the equipment, and we would not repeat our mistake. However, I dare say there will be few of us who will resist the opportunity and temptation to have the maximum amount of this equipment installed in our offices, regardless of how little need we have for it, if this resolution is adopted.

While I have not had an opportunity to read the resolution, from the explanation given by the gentleman from Virginia, and from hearing the clerk report the bill, I got the impression that the authorization was for the purchase of any electrical mechanical office equipment, which would include a variety of contraptions. A beverage cooler or an "office model" electrical refrigerator, would I believe, come within the scope of this resolution, and I do not think we would have to stretch the interpretation too far to include a radio or television set. Surely every office needs an electrically operated pencil sharpener. At least an enterprising salesman should have no difficulty in seeing that each Member spends the entire amount that he is allowed under the resolution. And

with a pair of electrically operated barber's clippers, we would have less reason to complain that another body has the advantage of free haircuts. In any event we will know it is the taxpayer who is getting clipped to the tune of more than a million dollars which could be saved.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I must disagree with my colleague from Iowa and the gentleman who just spoke. I have served in this body for 13 years and I have always maintained that we are penny-wise and pound-foolish as far as taking care of our own office equipment is concerned.

The responsibilities of a Member of Congress in the last 12 years have increased tremendously, yet we have had no increase in our office equipment. The population of my congressional district has almost doubled and it is utterly impossible for me to keep up with the tremendous volume of correspondence that comes into my office without some sort of mechanical help. I do not believe the citizens I represent would want me to pay money out of my own pocket in order to properly serve their needs.

I sincerely hope on sober reflection and on second thought the gentlemen who originally opposed this resolution today will see fit to support it. I hope if a roll call is had that it will be passed overwhelmingly because you and I know in this day and age the Congress of the United States, sitting as the board of directors of the biggest business in the world, must have the necessary and sufficient equipment and a clerical staff to do the job and do it well.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If a Member feels he does not need the equipment he does not have to apply for it, does he?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. He does not have to apply for it, certainly not.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. It is stated that this equipment will last 10 years. If it does and costs \$1,000,000, on the basis of a life of 10 years, that involves an expenditure of only \$100,000 a year and the equipment still belongs to the Government, while at the same time it increases the efficiency of the Members' offices and, as the gentleman says, we should not approach this problem in a short-sighted manner.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Most of us spend additional money now over and above our

allowance for letters that are mechanically typed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Almost every Member of the House is out of pocket for the mechanical work he has to have done in the minority or majority room.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Have we heard any such complaint about providing equipment for the executive branch of the Government, the administrative agencies of Government? Have we heard anybody get up here and complain about money to buy mechanical equipment for the various Government offices?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. As a matter of fact, as the agencies expand we supply them with more and more equipment.

Mr. POAGE. Does not the gentleman think the work of the Congress is just as important as the work of the administrative agencies?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Far more important today.

I am not asking for free haircuts such as they have in another body because I am not interested in them. I do not need one very often and there are a few other Members of the House, including the present occupant of the chair, who are in the same fix. I don't ask for free lunches, luxuries, or unnecessary perquisites. All I ask is that we have the staff and the equipment necessary to do our jobs.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I regret to oppose an apparently constructive, progressive measure. The chief reason why I oppose this resolution is that, as far as I know, it would cause a waste of money. I have not been able to get a copy of the resolution. I sent for one, and they did not have a copy they could give me, so I have not had an opportunity to read it.

I think the acquiring of such mechanisms could be valuable to some offices. I have a district which has over 500,000 people in it. I bought one of these machines myself about 2 years ago. I think it serves some useful purpose, but I do think that not even half the Members of Congress could profitably use this machine.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. This resolution does not specify any particular machine. It could be a dictaphone or anything the Member thinks would serve his purpose in his particular office.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I think this resolution is primarily designed to get these particular machines. If I had a copy of the resolution I could tell better about it. I want to see to it that everybody is not going to get something that somebody just thinks would be good for them, but that would just sit around their offices and collect dust. I do not want to cut down on the Members getting good equipment that might be used

to advantage by many of the Members, but I do not want to see the equipment wasted and stand around unused in any office.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SITTLER. It is at the option of the members to get this equipment. This is not foisted upon a Member or given to him without his consent, he gets it with the approval of the House.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Is there going to be any device provided so that everybody will not simply rush in and get one? I put out about \$1,500 for one. I thought it was that good. But when I got it I found it was not that good. I found my office staff did not want to use it. I find that it gathers dust. I do not use it more often than once in 2 or 3 months if that often. It has been almost a total waste to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I may say that I also paid about \$1,500 for one of them and I could use another one. Mine stays busy all the time, and I stay right behind in answering my mail.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I personally would like to see this thing go over and let it be studied a little more carefully to see to it that we do not encourage Members to procure equipment which they are ultimately not going to want, but which they think now they may want. That is my only objection. I have no objection to getting any amount of equipment that will be helpful and that will help the Members perform their duties to their constituents. What I do not want to see is any Member procuring equipment which will ultimately be a waste and which will not result in any benefit to our country.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who favor the resolution. This resolution provides not just equipment like high speed automatic machines about which our friend from Florida spoke. This authorization might be used for modern electric typewriters, which of course can type better and do better work, and which makes the work easier for the hard-pressed clerks in the Congressman's office. In addition, as has been said, it can be dictaphones or any sound-recording equipment, or it might be a machine to make plates that might have your various lists, or to address lists automatically, seal envelopes, or any useful office equipment that in the Member's judgment will expedite congressional work. So if you have items that are interesting to various groups in your district you can send out information that will bring your district up to date, and abreast of the issues.

I think it should always be borne in mind that we should depend upon the integrity of the Member when he decides whether or not he needs the equipment. He alone knows the workload he has in his office. This resolution leaves it



up to each Member to decide what will best serve his constituents.

There are those of us who have spent much on electrical equipment. I have spent about \$1,500. I bought one of these Robotypers and electric typewriter, and also have a converter for my Washington office.

The difference in congressional districts should be taken into consideration. I am from a district where I think everybody was born with either a pen or a pencil in his right hand and my address in his left hand, because on the question that has just been before the House today, I have extra help in order to take care of 3,000 unanswered letters on that one issue, all coming from the southern part of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.

There are sleeper districts in the United States, there is no doubt about it. There are, I am afraid, some people who like their districts to be quiet. But if a Congressman wants to give good service to his district, and if he wants to bring the issues to their attention, and dares to do so, the Congressman will need and will want the modern equipment that will help him to do a good office job. I think the Congress ought to vote for the resolution. It is not wasted money to do good, efficient work. It is not wasted money to bring these vitally important current issues and your views to the attention of your constituents. It is in the interest of the United States that your constituents should know the issues, and it is in the interest of the United States for you Congressmen to have the respect and integrity to decide whether you individually need this equipment or not. I, for one, will look carefully to see whether I need the equipment, and to see to it that there is no waste. My office secretaries and clerks are a hard-working and efficient group, and put in much overtime work, giving good service to our district. We all take a matter of personal pride in our faithful loyalty to the good people who have placed such confidence in us, and who come to us on so many of their personal problems with this vast and intricate Federal Government of ours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a question that the Committee on House Administration has had under consideration for a long time. It had this under consideration during the Eighty-first Congress, and reported a resolution which provided that members might purchase a certain amount of electrical equipment out of the money appropriated for their clerk hire. There was some objection to that resolution, and it was withdrawn and never brought back to the floor again. So, for this entire Congress, the committee has had this matter under consideration. We have had many requests for some funds to be made available for the purchase of electrical office equipment. The committee, I think, was almost unanimous with the exception of the gentleman who spoke against it, a member of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LeCompte]. As I say, the committee was almost unanimous in believing that

this should be made available to the Members of the House. It is just in keeping with equipment which is in most all well operated, and well regulated offices. We are living in a day of machines and have for a long time been living in a machine age, and in order to be able to compete with those who do similar business, you must have this kind of equipment to operate with.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Naturally, the Members themselves, the men and women who are Members of this House, should look at the wear and tear on the human machine. We of Pennsylvania have lost three Congressmen within 4 months this year, and largely from things that were caused by overwork. The Members should think of themselves too.

Mr. STANLEY. The committee feels that the provision to make available to each Member the sum of \$1,500 for this equipment out of the contingent fund is reasonable. Then, the committee further thought that if any Member felt an additional need, he could have clearance for the purchase of additional equipment out of any saving he might have from his clerk hire allowance up to \$1,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is this electrical equipment referred to connected with direct or indirect current motors?

Mr. STANLEY. It is made to run on the current we now have, which is direct current here in the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the current is changed, as I understand that work is now being done in the building, what then?

Mr. STANLEY. We are told that they have converters and either current may be used. So the machine would not become obsolete in case they were brought to be used on direct current. They could be used on alternating current later.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, to buy the converters would be an additional expense. If the current was later changed to alternating current, within a year let us say, then all of these converters would be surplus equipment and would have no value.

Mr. STANLEY. I am informed that there would be no additional expense as the machines are originally furnished complete, adapted to the type of electric power available.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Certainly, it would be an additional expense. The converter is a special piece of equipment which comes on the line between the direct current which we have to convert to alternating current. I have one in my office to use on a tape machine, and I paid sixty-and-some-odd dollars for it. That would be out and of no use if the current were changed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. This particular equipment is not made with converters, but it is made with direct-current motors. There is a great demand for them because anything that runs from a battery practically has to use it. If this building should be changed to alternating current, it would simply be a proposition of changing the motor to an alternating-current motor, and then the direct-current motors could be disposed of with practically no loss at all.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You mean the companies who would furnish this electrical equipment agree to change them over without any charge after we purchase them?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. They have so stated to the committee.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 187]

Allen, La.	Fallon	Murray, Wis.
Anfuso	Garmatz	Passman
Baker	Granahan	Patterson
Barrett	Green	Philbin
Bender	Gregory	Potter
Bensen	Hart	Powell
Boggs, Del.	Havenner	Priest
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Rabaut
Bolling	Heller	Ramsay
Breen	Herlong	Redden
Brehm	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Regan
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Richards
Budge	Hollifield	Rivers
Busbey	Howell	Sadlak
Case	Irving	St. George
Chatham	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Cole, N. Y.	James	Seely-Brown
Combs	Kelley, Pa.	Shafer
Cooley	Keogh	Short
Corbett	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Lucas	Staggers
Crosser	McConnell	Stockman
Davis, Tenn.	McCulloch	Taylor
Dawson	Mason	Thornberry
Deane	Meador	Vinson
D'Ewart	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Dingell	Miller, Nebr.	Wier
Durham	Morano	Willis
Eaton	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Eberharter	Morton	Wood, Ga.
Ellsworth	Moulder	Wood, Idaho
Elston	Mumma	
Engle	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 330 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### ELECTRIC OFFICE EQUIPMENT FOR MEMBERS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I should like to know if it would be in order to ask that this resolution be again read, together

with the amendment which has been adopted, in order that the Members may know what we are voting on.

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent.

Mr. STANLEY. I make that request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the resolution, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Missouri moves that House Resolution 318 be recommitted to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 44, noes 154.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri), there were—ayes 181, noes 65.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on October 3, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against William L. Patterson, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WILLIAM L. PATTERSON, NO. CRIMINAL 1787-50

To Hon. HENDERSON L. LANHAM of Georgia, House Office Building:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at United States District Court House in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 3d day of October 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m. to testify in the case of the United States v. William L. Patterson, defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By C. J. RUMSEY, Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 442).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative HENDERSON LANHAM, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 10 a. m. on the 3d day of October 1951, in the case of the United States v. William L. Patterson, Criminal Docket No. 1787-50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative HENDERSON LANHAM is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the United States v. William L. Patterson at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on October 3, 1951, at 10:30 a. m., in the case of the United States against William L. Patterson, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WILLIAM L. PATTERSON, NO. CRIMINAL 1787-50

To Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota, House Office Building:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at United States District Court House in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 3d day of October 1951, at 10:30 a. m. to testify in the case of the United States v. William L. Patterson, defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By C. J. RUMSEY, Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 443).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 10:30 a. m., on the 3d day of October 1951, in the case of the United States v. William L. Patterson, Criminal Docket No. 1787-50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the United States v. William L. Patterson at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourns to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTERIM AUTHORITY TO THE CLERK AND THE SPEAKER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### CHANGED PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF OCTOBER 1

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring about some changes which I understand have been made in the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. It has been agreed upon among the leadership—I think that is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. It has been agreed that on Thursday we will call up the bill (H. R. 3669) amending the Railroad Retirement Act, call it up for general debate, at least, with the understanding that any vote on the bill will go over until the next day, Friday.

Thereafter House Resolution 426, providing for certain studies of the Railroad Retirement Act, will be in order.

In the light of the above changes I am programming S. 1335 to adjust the



weight and size limit of fourth-class mail packages for Wednesday. If for any reason this bill does not come up Wednesday, it will then follow H. R. 3669 and House Resolution 426.

If any legislation comes out that is in order in connection with the Missouri flood situation, I shall program that for Wednesday. If it is not ready for Wednesday I will consider that legislation of vital importance. I shall have to have flexibility in relation to the program to put it ahead of some of the other bills. I am hopeful it will be in order by Wednesday so that the House may consider it. Any other changes will be announced as soon as possible. But the leadership wanted to announce to the House the change in connection with the bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act from Wednesday to Thursday and that the final vote will be on Friday.

Mr. JUDD. Can the gentleman tell us when it is probable that the conference report on the Mutual Security Act will be considered?

Mr. McCORMACK. If in order, I expect that to come up on Wednesday. I expect that I shall ask permission that the House meet early on Wednesday. It is according to what the legislative situation is at that time. If the conference report is agreed to by the other body and is in order it will come up Wednesday at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not quite understand about the Railroad Retirement Act. Will that come up and be considered on Thursday, but no vote until Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the present plan.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 335. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER, members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52-7.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 25 minutes.

#### THE POWER TO DECLARE WAR HAS BEEN TAKEN FROM CONGRESS, IF THE UNITED NATIONS IS NOT SET ASIDE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, while the Constitution of the United States, section 8, article I, says the power of declaring war is a duty and responsibility of Congress, this wise provision has been set aside and it is doubtful if Congress

will ever again have any power or authority over whether or not this country shall enter a war.

The Charter of the United Nations, as approved by the Senate, has stripped Congress of this power. The Charter provides:

Article 43: 1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory States in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Article 44: When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations assumed under article 43, invite that member, if the member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that member's armed forces.

Article 45: In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, members shall hold immediately available national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 46: Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 47: 1. There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.

2. The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the committee shall be invited by the committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that member in its work.

3. The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. Questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently.

4. The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council and after consultation with appropriate regional agencies, may establish regional subcommittees.

Article 48: 1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for

the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.

Article 49: The members of the United Nations shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

Article 50: If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

Article 51: Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

We could have legally entered the Korean war according to the United Nations Charter if the President had followed the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, but he did not do that—he sent the troops of the United States into Korea without following the Charter and several hours before the United Nations took any action at all in the matter. The United Nations followed the President.

Congress was again stripped of the power to declare war when the Atlantic Pact was passed, for this provides, in relation to actual war, that when any of the nations who have signed the pact are attacked it is deemed an attack against all, and it is the duty of this country forthwith to go to the rescue of the nation attacked. No declaration of war is necessary, as that obligation of Congress was given away in the passing of the pact.

From careful reading of these provisions, this Nation, as a member, has already pledged itself to immediately offer troops and equipment to enter a war, without the consent of Congress. The number of troops, the kind of troops and kind of equipment, are fixed by special agreements with the Security Council, and upon call of the United Nations these forces go into action, without further consulting Congress.

In the Korean war, the President erred in entering it so fast, as no special agreements had been made, and our entry was before the United Nations ordered intervention. But that is not so material, because the President could have entered into this special agreement as to troops, and they would have been called to fight when ordered by the Security Council.

What we have done, by accepting that Charter, is to take away from Congress

the power to say when our troops shall engage in war.

Even in the defense of our own country, where an invasion occurs, we can take initial action, but must report what we have done to the Security Council; and our action shall not in any way affect the authority of the Security Council to take such action as it may determine in our case. In other words, the defense of this country, at any time, is taken away from us and delivered lock, stock and barrel, to the Security Council. Our historic right of self-defense, in any manner we choose to exercise it, is gone.

When we have made these special agreements with the Security Council to furnish troops and equipment, the amount and kind, they shall be subject to ratification by the signatory States in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. That provision suggests that Congress will have the right to approve these agreements, but since the agreements have already been entered into, and perhaps a war has been started, Congress is in no position to say "No." In the Korean war the President not only failed to make any special agreements, so there was nothing to submit to Congress, but he failed to even advise Congress what was contemplated. From our own conduct in this Korean war, you can see how the constitutional provision making a declaration of war the duty of Congress, has been circumvented.

Can you think of a single case in the future of this country when Congress will determine whether or not we enter a conflict? That power has been turned over to the Security Council or the United Nations.

What about the Atlantic Pact and the power of Congress to declare war? Article 5 of the North Atlantic Pact provides:

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

It will thus be seen that in approving the North Atlantic Pact the Congress gave away its power to declare war. As soon as an armed attack is made against one of the parties to the pact, we agree forthwith to enter into such conflict, without any further action by Congress. This is a delegation of power not authorized by the Constitution. The President is not to blame for the transfer of this power of Congress, but Congress itself is to blame by passing the act. Members of Congress who voted for this pact cannot now be heard to complain because the power to declare war has been taken away from Congress.

Here is seen a perfect example of the scheme and plan to build in the world a supergovernment at the expense of

the sovereign power of the states composing the United Nations. In every field of endeavor of the United Nations can be seen this design and plan to strip the United States of its sovereign power as a great government. According to this scheme, we are to be a state in a great nation of states, with our destiny not shaped by ourselves, but by a super-government. Our Government, our educational system, our trade and commerce, our own domestic laws, the control of our Armies, Navies, and Air Forces are to be given completely to this super-world-government, all in the name of preserving peace. Is that the kind of peace the builders of this great Nation want? Is peace so sweet that we are willing to be made slaves in order to obtain it?

The tragedy in the surrender of our individual liberties and the dissolution of this great sovereign Nation lies in the fact that under our own system we have become the leader among nations; we have grown powerful and prosperous; we feed the world; our school system, our means of disseminating information through the press, books and the radio, make available to the people knowledge that no other government offers or will permit. The encouragement given science and invention by our educational systems and direct appropriations from Congress has made us an outstanding leader in that field. In other words, our Nation has become the beacon light of liberty to all countries.

Are we meekly to surrender this great achievement in government in the name of peace?

Another tragedy is that a great number of good people are giving their efforts to build this so-called superior power. We should not let the desire for a pictured peace lead us astray. Everybody wants peace, but it can't be obtained for us if we are to lose our great sovereign power. We have made two fatal attempts to build world peace, and are now making the third attempt.

We entered World War I to make the world "safe for democracy," but when it ended democracy was safe nowhere. We entered World War II for the four freedoms, freedom from fear being the cardinal one. When the war ended fear seized the people everywhere. In the Korean war we proposed to stop communism and liberate people who desire freedom, but when we get through we may find that we have brought some freedom to others but have lost our own.

Peace is so hoped for by all common people in the world that almost anything can be done in the name of peace. As important as peace is, it is not as important as liberty. Liberty is the greatest gift of the Almighty, and we should be willing to fight for it—not humbly submit to a compromised liberty in the name of peace. Our New England ancestors wanted peace. They fled Europe to obtain peace, but when they attended church here they carried a Bible under one arm and a shotgun under the other.

We are not worthy to be their sons if we are afraid to stand up for liberty.

There are three ways we can escape the powers of the United Nations in

seeking to build a world government and take away the sovereign powers of the United States.

First. Test the constitutionality of the court's decision in the Fujii case, which will bring up the question of whether or not the approval of the Charter of the United Nations by the President and the Senate was a constitutional act. In my opinion the approval was unconstitutional, as from time immemorial in our life as a Nation a treaty has always been construed as an undertaking between nations. It has never been recognized that any treaty ever made, or to be made, could affect the constitutions and laws of the contracting nations. It has always been held to be an agreement between nations, taking the nations as they exist individually at the time of the agreement. Here, in the case of the approval of the United Nations Charter, the Federal circuit court in the State of California interprets the treaty as authority for setting aside a State law. No such power in a treaty was ever before recognized in this country.

It would appear that the approval of a treaty that does, in effect, concern itself with the repeal of State laws, and has nothing to do with relations between the contracting parties as they existed at the date of the approval of the treaty, is clearly unconstitutional.

The power of the President, with the approval of the Senate, to make a treaty at all, is derived from the Constitution. Hence can it be said that an act derived from the Constitution can destroy the Constitution itself? The unconstitutionality of the approval of the Charter is so clearly discernible that further argument seems unnecessary. The Constitution itself provides the manner in which the Constitution can be changed. Hence any attempt to change it by indirection through any carefully worded treaty is clearly not authorized, and any attempt to do it is unconstitutional.

Second. If a treaty is an agreement between nations, what nation did we undertake to make a treaty with when we approved the Charter of the United Nations? None of the nations that existed at the time the Charter of the United Nations was presented to the United States for approval was a party. There was no party to the contract with us except the United Nations, which, from its very origin, could not be a separate entity capable of contracting by treaty. So far as the United States is concerned, the United Nations never came into being until we approved its Charter. When its Charter was approved by the 60 nations, then the United Nations came into being so far as those nations are concerned; not as a nation with treaty-making powers, but as an agency of all the nations forming it.

Therefore, its Charter could not be approved in the way treaties are made, but the approval of such an agency could be made by an act of Congress, the same as all other agencies are created. Here in the United States this was not done. Hence our pretended approval of the Charter was unconstitutional and void. Since this is true, Congress can, by an act, declare it void and of no effect in the United States.



Third. To escape the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Congress of the United States can pass an act withdrawing from that organization.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman stated that "whenever it is necessary." Does the gentleman mean whenever they think it is necessary?

Mr. BURDICK. That is right. Everything is left to the judgment of the Security Council.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has made several very remarkable contributions on this same subject. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Our men are now fighting to contain communism, several hundred thousand of them, as the gentleman mentioned, to prevent the Communists from destroying this Republic. Here in America we are trying to prevent them from destroying it by force, prosecuting them and sending them to jail. What is the difference in principle between those Communists who would destroy this Government by force and those who, like former Chief Justice Roberts and that group, would have us surrender our independence, as you have pointed out, to the United Nations? Is not the effect practically the same?

Mr. BURDICK. No. The latter is more dangerous.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Because we do not sense it?

Mr. BURDICK. Because we do not sense it. The latter is more dangerous because they work without our knowledge. You can take care of the enemies you can see, but you cannot always take care of those you do not see.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman touches a point that gravely concerns most of the Members of this body. I know he has given a lot of thought to it. I am sure it was not with a conscious intention of a single Member of this body when he voted upon these various matters, or in the other body, that we would subject the laws of our State and our Government to the whims of the United Nations. Certainly we did not intend for the creature to overpower the creator. The gentleman has studied the problem; does he have suggestions upon which we may act that would be a safeguard to our States and our Nation that our laws will not be invaded?

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman for his question, because that is material, what to do about it. Here is what you can do about it: When that charter was approved by the United States Senate when the United Nations was incapable of making a treaty it was unconstitutional and void; all you have to do is to pass an act of Congress saying so and you are out of it. They could have created the United Nations for the

purpose of protecting the peace by an act of this Congress, which is the way other agencies are set up; but they did not do that.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. Does the gentleman think it would be feasible to withdraw altogether? As I gathered a moment ago the gentleman felt that the most plausible and feasible step would be to take such action as would insure that our local laws and our Constitution would not be vitiated or violated rather than to withdraw entirely from this worthy purpose of creating a forum whereby the problems of the world might be settled peacefully.

Mr. BURDICK. I would withdraw from the construction that the United Nations have put upon that approval; and I would not be opposed to gathering the same nations together for the purpose of acting as our agents to preserve the peace of the world; I would agree with that.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very glad the gentleman has in his remarks pointed out this weak place in the structure of the United Nations. That is a matter that has distressed many of us. It is nevertheless correct that there is this structural weakness. I believe the gentleman from North Dakota will be interested in knowing that a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is now studying very diligently this very problem which he has called to the attention of the House.

Mr. BURDICK. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution. I may say in passing that I presume there are a great many people who think I am pretty severe on this organization, but I cannot remain silent when the sovereign power of this Republic is threatened.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### THE INTEGRITY OF THE LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to say that I had no information that the President would send down today the message he did; and, certainly, I had no knowledge of its contents. What I shall say is an approach to the same problem discussed by the President, but from a different angle. This is not in any sense, of course, an answer to the President's message; because, as I say, I knew nothing about it when I prepared what I shall say.

I think the President is right when he says there is a determined effort and a movement to discredit not only the administration, but the Congress, and I regret that as much as the President does.

What the President proposes, and I have not had time to study it or to really make up my mind about whether it is

sound or not, but what the President proposes might help in the future.

But what I am going to talk about is what has already happened, and I want to emphasize the fact that the things that have been happening in Washington have given ammunition to those people who are seeking to discredit the administration and discredit the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, you and the Members of the House are well aware of my loyalty to the Democratic Party. I have voted consistently for the party program when I could conscientiously do so; for I believe that party responsibility is a necessary element in our democratic government. I have not been in favor of the extension of the welfare state, although I have not and do not now condemn as socialistic every proposal made for the welfare of the people as a whole. As our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, has so well said, many of these programs are nothing more than dynamic democracy in action.

My belief is that, as John Temple Graves has said, the New Deal has been dealt, and that any further major extension of the welfare state would result in the destruction of the spirit of self-dependence of our people, and take away some of their personal initiative. But I have voted for adequate funds for the continuation of those features of the New Deal program—which, by the way, I am sure saved us from communism or socialism during the dark days of the depression of the thirties—which have become an accepted part of our social and economic life; and which few now would propose to repeal.

When Mr. Truman made his brave, spectacular, and victorious fight for the Presidency against overwhelming odds, I took a definite stand—and was the first in my State delegation to do so—in favor of his candidacy. As a matter of fact, my recollection is that every member of the Georgia delegation in both the Senate and House supported the Democratic Party and refused to go off on a tangent after the so-called Dixiecrat movement. We did this because we believe in the basic and fundamental principles of the Democratic Party although we do not approve of many of the recent unwise additions to the old Democratic Party principles, such as the so-called civil-rights program, socialized medicine, the farm subsidy program, known as the Brannan plan, and other programs recently included in the party platform. We stayed in the party to try to regenerate it from within and correct the mistakes in its platform, rather than to follow the abortive Dixiecrat movement.

I say all this because I think my loyalty to the party and the major well-established principles for which it stands entitles me to say what I am going to say this afternoon. Definitely now the time has come to regenerate and clean up the party.

I love the Democratic Party but I do not approve the influence peddling, the mink coats, the deep freezes, free trips to Florida, 11½-pound hams—some of them petty things it is true—that have

come to light recently through investigations sponsored and carried to a successful conclusion by such stalwart young Democrats as Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; and others who have been uncompromising in their efforts to uncover whatever bribery and corruption and whatever lowering of public morals might exist in our Government.

It is true that the shady and evil-smelling acts that have come to light and that have been brought to the surface by these investigations, are but emblematic and symptomatic of a general worsening of public morals and a general lowering of ethical and moral standards that have been creeping and spreading like a cancerous growth throughout our twentieth century civilization. This lowering of moral and ethical standards is evident from what has been happening in a few of our colleges where students have been bribed to fix athletic games and even in our Academy at West Point. It is evident in the attitude of businessmen who seek to buy the influence of Government officials and law enforcement officers. For every official who is bribed or corrupted, someone is equally guilty in offering the bribe which leads to the corruption of the public official.

It is evident in the cheating by many of our people on their income-tax returns. It is made manifest by our changed attitude toward sexual standards and the conduct and relationship between the sexes. It stares at us from the voluptuous nudes, who flaunt their nakedness on the newsstands before the eyes of our boys. It glares at us from the pages of the so-called realistic and blasphemous books that we read. It is apparent from the sordid lives of some of our big-name entertainment stars. Corruption and influence peddling in public office is just a part of the whole malignant growth that threatens the destruction of our civilization from within. This malignant and cancerous growth—this falling away from integrity, this lowering of our moral standards can and will destroy us, if we do not call a halt and reverse the trend.

We do not have to look far to find the causes for this moral decay and degeneration. For the past 35 or 40 years our "intellectuals" and so-called philosophers have neglected spiritual values and have raised to major importance materialist values. Out of this has come the pragmatic philosophy that whatever works is right which dominates our intellectual thinking. We have emphasized material values and material things far out of proportion to their importance.

The same tendency to magnify material values and to put into second place spiritual and moral values has been evident also in our social thinking and relationships. The pragmatic philosophy that whatever works is right has led us to the point that we no longer believe that there are absolute moral standards or ethical principles. Some 20 years ago, I recall trying to read a book by Walter Lippmann entitled "A Preface to Morals"; Walter Lippmann is well known to all of you, and I have admired for a

long time his writings and read his column when available. I had read his Preface to Politics and enjoyed and profited by the reading, but when I opened the pages of A Preface to Morals I soon found that Mr. Lippmann had been caught up in the new philosophy and had come to the conclusion that the people of America had lost confidence in the validity and in the authority and reliability of the Old Testament Scriptures. I do not believe I am misquoting or misconstruing Mr. Lippmann's position. Believing as he did that we had lost faith in the moral authority of the Ten Commandments and the ethical standards of right and wrong set up in the Judeo-Christian religion, as we get it from the Bible, he proposed that we must find some pragmatic social standard to guide our conduct and to determine what is right and what is wrong. This is just one instance of the philosophic and social thinking of our age. Is it any wonder that our young people who have grown up during the past 20 years are unable to measure up in a few instances and resist the temptation to take the easy way out?

Mr. Speaker, the Southern States have been referred to in derision as the Bible Belt. I am happy that our section of the country has been so designated. It is true that oftentimes high religious principles and doctrines have been debased and made ridiculous by some of our religious fanatics in the South, but by and large we are an intelligent, believing, and a devout people, though we, too, have been influenced by modern religious and philosophic errors to some extent.

If we are to save America and ourselves from the moral rot and disintegration that is taking place, we must return to those absolute standards of right and wrong set up for our guidance in the Ten Commandments and the moral teachings of the great Prophets of the Jewish race and the spiritualized and sublimated version of these moral standards as given us in the teachings of Christ. While the Sermon on the Mount is too much for me, nevertheless, it is a standard which all of us should strive to reach in our social and individual living. To these standards we must return if we are to be saved from the moral and ethical disintegration that is going on all about us.

I have said that moral delinquency in our local, State, and National Governments is a part of the general moral deterioration that is so evident about us, yet this lack of morality and high ethical principles in those in high places is more reprehensible and more destructive because of its public influence than that at any other level of our society. For this reason I call for a thorough house cleaning by the President and by the leaders of our party of all who have transgressed and who have brought into disrepute our party and to some extent our Government itself. Our President himself is a man of character and integrity and I regret to say that his exaggerated sense of loyalty leads him to condone conduct which if not actually illegal definitely falls short of the high moral and ethical standards that ought to dominate the

conduct and character of those in public office. Our political leaders and our men in public life should, like Caesar's wife, be above suspicion.

I call for the resignation or removal of Mr. Boyle, the chairman of the Democratic executive committee. He is an affable and likable man and this affability may have been, in some measure, the cause for his efforts to help others. But there is already enough evidence that he has profited financially since he became chairman of the Democratic executive committee by using the influence of his position to make him ineligible for that high position. I do not believe Mr. Boyle has been guilty of any illegal or any immoral conduct, but he has compromised himself and our party, it seems to me. Moreover, all those in the executive departments who have been guilty of accepting gifts for their influence, should be discharged.

If the party is not cleaned up and if those in the administration who have been weighed and found wanting are not purged from the party, I am afraid the results at the polls next year will be disastrous.

May I pay a tribute in passing to a man high in our Government who has shown remarkable courage and statesmanship since he has been made head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, where so much of the governmental moral rot and infection has been localized. I refer to Mr. Stuart Symington, who has insisted that those now in his organization live up to the highest ethical and moral standards and has promptly discharged all who have fallen short of the high standards he has set. May his tribe increase.

All I have said I have meant to say in the kindest of spirit and with the humble realization that I, too, am human and liable to err, but with a prayer that I may have the strength of character to resist the temptations that come to all men in public life to lower their standards for financial or political reasons.

Let me close by repeating an old poem which I think expresses so well the crying need of our times:

#### God Give Us Men

God give us men. The time demands  
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and  
willing hands.  
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;  
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;  
Men who possess opinions and a will;  
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;  
Men who can stand before a demagog  
And damn his treacherous flatteries without  
winking;  
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the  
fog  
In public duty and in private thinking.  
For while the rabble with their thumb-worn  
creeds,  
Their large professions, and their little deeds  
Mingle in selfish strife; lo, freedom weeps.  
Wrong rules the land, and waiting justice  
sleeps.

—J. G. Holland.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?  
Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wish to commend the gentleman for the state-



ment he has made. It is just exactly what those of us who know him best would expect. Now, omitting or not considering those statements which the gentleman has made which refer to the President and to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and perhaps to others, it occurred to me as the gentleman was speaking that his thoughts ran almost parallel to what might be called the sermon delivered not long ago by former President Hoover, who spoke along the same lines and expressed practically the same sentiments as the gentleman did, calling for a revival of honesty in National Government.

Mr. LANHAM. I think it is the thing most needed in the country today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### WHOSE BUSINESS IS PHONY?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, in its October 1951 issue the Reader's Digest prints an article entitled "Phony Business," which is labeled as having been "adapted from Red Oak (Iowa) Express as quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

It is, of course, very difficult to adapt a rather long newspaper account into a short article. In doing so the Reader's Digest has, in this case, made a frankly critical article appear even more critical. In the article the Digest has raised the question of honesty and good faith on the part of the Rural Electrification Administration. The charges are nonetheless serious because they are implied rather than frankly stated.

Basically the complaint is that REA has asked applicants for rural-telephone loans to borrow more money than these applicants have requested. This is undoubtedly true, and in the absence of any explanation might well be the basis of condemnation. There is, however, what I believe to be a very proper and logical explanation, and it was available from exactly the same source which the Digest used to get this article—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On August 15, 1951, Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, inserted in the RECORD a comprehensive statement covering all of the details of this transaction, and specifically refuting the only definite and positive statement of improper action contained in the Digest article.

I have always held the Reader's Digest in such high esteem that I can but surmise that its editorial staff had not seen Senator GILLETTE's answer. I am not prepared to assume that the Reader's Digest would knowingly and deliberately present such a distorted picture as that contained in the article.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. When Flynn's book, *The Road Ahead*, was published in the Reader's Digest, the gentleman will recall a letter was included that was so cut that it omitted statements which

the writer expressed opposing the Flynn book, but the editor of the Reader's Digest so mutilated that letter that it appeared as approving the book by Mr. Flynn. I know that that was not accidental.

Mr. POAGE. I do not know what was accidental and what was intentional, but I do know that in this case the criticism which was contained in the original article was sharpened up in the adaptation of the Digest.

The fact is that very few of us realize just how much technical advancement has been made in the telephone business since I was a boy and talked over a barbed wire fence. It is still possible to talk over wire fences, but it is not possible to get good service that way, nor is a phone system which depends on antiquated equipment likely to be good security for a 35-year loan.

The REA is prohibited by law from making loans unless both of two conditions are met:

First. The proposed service shall be made available to the widest number of rural users. This is what we have come to call area coverage. It is expensive to give service to all the farms in an area, and many telephone companies do not ask for enough money to serve all. Too often the telephone company proposes to serve only the most profitable part of the area, and seeks no funds to build lines to the more remote farms, which often need service most. It was to assure service to these remote farms that Congress placed this "area coverage" provision in the law. Congress realized that if only the more profitable connections were made in a community it would become utterly impossible for any other phone system to ever give service to the remainder. REA, therefore, properly says, "We will not lend you money to serve 60 percent of the people, but we will lend you money to serve 100 percent of the people." REA cannot legally make a loan without satisfying this requirement for area coverage.

Second. The Administrator of REA must certify that in his judgment the loan will be repaid with interest within the specified period, usually 35 years. Satisfactory service to the largest practicable number of rural people during the entire life of the loan obviously offers the greatest assurance that a rural telephone system will be able to repay its loan. Satisfactory service over a 35-year period can only be expected if the system is properly designed, constructed and equipped. Often a short-term loan to serve only part of the families wanting service may be a safe investment without the assurance of long-time, satisfactory service which the REA standards require. It is, therefore, entirely possible to cite instances where a company may be able to get a smaller loan from a private source than REA would make.

In the case cited the REA states that it was the considered judgment of its telephone engineers and specialists that a loan of \$175,000—the amount of the application—would be far from adequate to complete the rehabilitation, expansion, and improvements necessary to assure

good area-wide telephone service in the Villisca territory. They felt that from the standpoint of loan security the larger loan would be safer. They recognized, of course, that a "patchwork" job could be done for considerably less money, but they did not feel it would be as economical, last as long, or meet the requirements of the law.

REA is not a charity organization. It does not give away public money. It makes loans which have to be repaid with interest. It is the duty of REA to see to it that the security is ample and that the earning capacity of the system is such that the income will be available to meet the loan payments for years to come. In order to meet these obligations REA has properly required its borrowers to meet rigid standards of construction. To know that the borrower himself gets what he pays for, as well as to know that the security is just what it is supposed to be, REA has required that every construction job be supervised by a competent, impartial engineer. This is the invariable rule of all larger private companies.

In this case REA proposed to lend 7 percent of the construction costs to cover engineering fees—not fees for REA engineers, as the article incorrectly stated, but fees for outside engineers to be selected by the borrower. Had this requirement been omitted, I suspect that REA would have been bitterly criticized for "their careless waste of public funds."

The article quotes the manager of the local telephone company as saying he did not need an engineer "when we have our own employees and equipment suppliers who will provide their own engineering." The original article from which the Digest's adaptation was taken shows that the engineers of the telephone company included the manager, three linemen, eight operators, and a bookkeeper. The same article names the directors of the company and says that all are farmers except one, who is an implement dealer, and one who is a real estate and insurance broker. I submit that the employment of an outside engineer was essential to the financial solvency of the company, unless it was proposed to let the suppliers of material be the judges of the quality of their own wares.

As the author of the bill which authorized rural telephone loans, I sincerely wish it were possible to get full area coverage and to bring first-class telephone service to all farm people at 1935 costs, but it cannot be done, and I am glad to see the REA require sound business practices and the installation of adequate facilities to give all the people of a community the type of service which will endure. REA is doing a better and more businesslike job than some telephone companies are doing, and I believe that this is true in the case described by the Reader's Digest.

#### DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NEW ENGLAND IN THE MATTER OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the other day on the floor I reminded the House that I felt that in the award of Government contracts there was unfairness and discrimination against New England and that I was having that investigated. My remarks were mislaid and they have not as yet appeared in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind it is very obvious that the labor market in Massachusetts, in fact in all of New England, is being depleted. One of the instances was the removal of the district office of the Veterans' Administration to Philadelphia. There are a good many other instances. It was very different during World War II when I felt there was much more fairness in the treatment of industry in Massachusetts and in New England, also in the awarding of contracts. The situation that exists today is terribly unfair. It hurts us now, but ultimately it will hurt war production.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MORANO in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. ARENDT).

Mr. STEFAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. REAMS and to include an editorial from the Toledo Blade on the subject of freedom of the Press Gallery.

Mr. LANE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM in seven instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCKINNON (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE and to include appropriate material.

Mr. ROBINO and to include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a letter endorsing the House version of the amputee car bill.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include a resolution from the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

Mr. GOODWIN in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NORBLAD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENISON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARRETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VELDE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include two resolutions.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO) and to include a speech.

Mr. MURDOCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JARMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and to include an editorial.

Mr. POULSON in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN in two instances, in each to include extraneous printed matter.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 335. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BROWN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for today, on account of office business.

Mr. KING, for 1 day, on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, October 1, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

825. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

826. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

827. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

828. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Fajla Tuchmajer Ajzin nee Tuchmajer, file No. A-6819145 CR 33295, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

829. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Iona (Helen) Goldstein, file No. A-6465693 CR 34726, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 335. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1063). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3368. A bill providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 1064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4808. A bill to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5426. A bill relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 249. Resolution for the relief of the estate of Ovila P. Gaucher; without amendment (Rept. No. 1067). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 410. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 390 which creates a select committee on the Katyn Forest massacre; without amendment (Rept. No. 1068). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 403. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1069). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 415. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and studies authorized by House Resolution 158; with amendment (Rept. No. 1070). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 417. Resolution to provide additional funds for the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 33; without amendment (Rept. No. 1071). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 433. Resolution providing for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 78. Eighty-second Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1072). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 318. Resolution authorizing the purchase of electric office equipment for use by Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 1073). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5067. A bill to authorize the use of the incomplete submarine *Uta* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1074). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.



Mr. LARCADE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 1949. A bill to retrocede to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over 154.2 acres of land used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, Madison County, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1075). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3548. A bill to provide that payments to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commences; with amendment (Rept. No. 1076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4049. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5405. A bill to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 1078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5131. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report pursuant to House Resolution 33, Eighty-first Congress, first session. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2604. A bill to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir, colonel, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Regular Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 1080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLVERTON:  
H. R. 5502. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5503. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and

own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5504. A bill to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 to increase the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to the national defense; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 5505. A bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 5506. A bill making an emergency authorization of an appropriation for the purpose of erecting in Bluefield, W. Va., a post office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 5507. A bill making an emergency authorization and appropriation for the purpose of erecting in Lake Charles, La., a post office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5508. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5509. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 5510. A bill to authorize the heads of the executive departments and of the agencies and independent establishments of the Federal Government and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for the promotion and maintenance of recreation programs to improve the efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare of employees of their respective departments and agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 5511. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5512. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to install measures for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5513. A bill to extend certain benefits granted to widows of veterans of World War I to certain widows of such veterans not now entitled thereto; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5514. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, so as to extend the privilege of trial by jury to certain cases arising within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 335. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for

the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. J. Res. 336. Joint resolution authorizing and directing an investigation by the Coast Guard of the need for safety regulations applicable to small craft; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CASE:

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution favoring certain action against the Government of Czechoslovakia unless John Hvasta, citizen of the United States is released from custody; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5515. A bill for the relief of John H. Vogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 5516. A bill for the relief of Dimple Benoit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 5517. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Luise Trenye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5518. A bill for the relief of Pietro Petralia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 5519. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Turkett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 5520. A bill for the relief of Fredy Kohn, Anna Kohn, and Hugo Ronald Kohn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 5521. A bill for the relief of Miss Yoshiko Okura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 5522. A bill for the relief of Quan Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 5523. A bill for the relief of Hildegarde Purre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 5524. A bill for the relief of Miss Anna and Mr. Karl Bamberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5525. A bill for the relief of Abraham Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 5526. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. Ernest Ayre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 5527. A bill to provide for the lump-sum payment of the national service life insurance granted the late Lester T. Brown to his widow, Mrs. Gay Dobler Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINNON:

H. R. 5528. A bill for the relief of Thomas R. Grady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5529. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Giuseppe Scivanich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5530. A bill for the relief of Artur Duarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 5531. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Weite Paez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5532. A bill for the relief of the estate of Martin A. Gleason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5533. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5534. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5535. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5536. A bill for the relief of Chor Youl Park Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5537. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Ellen Atkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5538. A bill for the relief of Alexei Frank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 5539. A bill for the relief of Hiroko Doki and Takako Doki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 5540. A bill for the relief of Stamatis Karastamatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 5541. A bill for the relief of Capt. Walter C. Wolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5542. A bill for the relief of Isak Benmuvhar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 5543. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Rosalia Haste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 5544. A bill for the relief of Moy Yin Sue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday,  
September 19, 1951)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we come before Thee with thanksgiving grateful that each new day enfolds us with Thy loving kindness in the morning and Thy faithfulness every night. Cleanse our hearts, we pray Thee, from all guile that as a part of this corrupt and perverse generation we may abhor that which is evil and cleave to that which is good. May our attitudes and actions make us a part of the solution rather than of the problem of our ailing social order. As with moral and material might we smite and vow to shatter the rampant iniquity of today, which degrades Thy children and keeps them from more abundant life, grant us a vision of the far-off years as they may be if redeemed by the sons of God; that we may take heart in these days freighted with destiny and do battle for Thy children and ours, leaving the earth fairer and cleaner than we found it. We ask it in that Name which is above every name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 27, 1951, was dispensed with.

### REVENUE ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, during the remainder of the debate, can recognize only Senators to whom time is yielded by those who control it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in calling the roll be not charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona makes a point of no quorum. Is there objection to his unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Butler, Md.	Ives	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clements	Langer	Saltonstall
Connally	Lehman	Smathers
Dirksen	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Dworschak	Maybank	Stennis
Ferguson	McCarran	Underwood
George	McFarland	Watkins
Hayden	McMahon	Wiley
Holland	Millikin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The names of the absent Senators were called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. ELLENBERGER, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHN-

SON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHOEPPLE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THYE, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], on which he has 15 minutes, and on which, in opposition, the Senator from Georgia has 15 minutes.

### THE KOREAN PEACE CONFERENCE STALEMATE

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for 30 seconds?

Mr. LANGER. I yield 30 seconds.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, ever since July 10 the Communists in Korea have been backing and filling with us on a discussion of peace. There has been no recorded parallel in history when a nation with the power that we have has permitted a weaker enemy to drag out the discussions, clearly intended for the advantage of our enemy.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to continue these discussions into the winter months, with the attrition which is now happening to us and the opportunity to the enemy to build up its manpower, to leave us next spring in a worse position than we are in at the present time.

I say, Mr. President, much as we love peace, and much as we want peace, the time has come when we had better adopt the old military axiom, "The hotter the war, the sooner the peace," and notify our enemies that we are not going to be double-crossed any longer, that these are our terms on which we shall settle, and that if they are not going to settle, to say so, and then we will go all out to end a war that was forced upon the peace-loving but freedom-loving nations of the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

### REVENUE ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to modify my amendment on page 1, line 9, by striking out "of \$50 or more."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota modifies his amendment, which he has a right to do. The Chair asks Senators to help keep order. The Senate has entered into a limitation of time for debate, and it is desirable that we proceed as rapidly as possible. Therefore, the Chair hopes Senators will cooperate in trying to keep order. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, strange as it may seem to Senators, absolutely